


3 1761 04128 9364

the author.



SOCIALISM BEFORE THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION



SpA
G9845s.2
SOCIALISM BEFORE THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION
A HISTORY

BY
WILLIAM B. GUTHRIE, Ph.D.

INSTRUCTOR IN HISTORY, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
LECTURER IN SOCIAL SCIENCE UNDER THE BOARD OF
EDUCATION, AND ON FOREIGN INVESTMENTS IN
THE SCHOOL OF COMMERCE AND FINANCE
OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

568548
10.9.53

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1907

All rights reserved

HX

21

G8

cop. 2

COPYRIGHT, 1907,

By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped. Published June, 1907.



Norwood Press

J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.


To

MY FATHER AND SISTER

THIS VOLUME

IS AFFECTIONATELY

INSCRIBED



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

INTRODUCTION

ENGLISH literature has been singularly deficient in the history of social theory, and it is especially in the domain of social reform that this gap has been most evident. The present-day socialist movement has so engrossed the attention of most observers that even the historical studies of this subject have been largely confined to the period since the French Revolution and particularly to that of so-called scientific socialism. The foreign literatures have paid slightly more attention to some of the movements from the close of the Middle Ages, but there is to-day no satisfactory general account in any language of socialist doctrines before the end of the eighteenth century. The study of Mr. Guthrie is therefore to be welcomed as the first comprehensive attempt to fill the gap.

It will be easy for the reader to discern that the author is well fitted for the task which he has allotted to himself. A thorough familiarity with the foreign languages, a wide acquaintance with the details of the literature, and a grasp of the economic principles involved, — these are some of the characteristics of this little book. But there are especially

two points to which it is well to call attention as the distinctive contributions of the work.

The first is the recognition on the part of the author that social theory is the outgrowth of social conditions. The truth of this statement is nowadays apt to be recognized in connection with ordinary economic doctrines; but it has usually been assumed that the theories of the idealists, as pure figments of the imagination, are disconnected with actual life, and that all the utopias are to be put in the category of ordinary fairy tales. A more attentive study of the facts, however, is sufficient to make us realize that, from the time of Plato down to the present, the social idealists have stood with one foot on *terra firma*, and that even the utopian dreams have had a more or less intimate connection with the sober facts of every-day life. Mr. Guthrie has been wise in realizing this and in endeavoring to trace the relation between the actual environment of the author and the character of his doctrines.

The second point is that the work is calculated to bring home to the ordinary reader the fact that social strivings and social ideals are by no means confined to the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. It is indeed true that the stupendous industrial changes of the last hundred years have brought to the fore a peculiarly intensive species of socialism which could not have previously existed where the economic phe-

nomena themselves did not exist. We have, however, been too long under the obsession of the idea that socialism is a distinctively modern movement. Even as a practical movement, socialism is by no means modern. Not to speak of the great, and still only partly studied, revolutions of classic antiquity, the history of mediæval Europe abounds in more or less sharply defined socialistic tendencies. What is true of the socialist movement is no less true of the doctrine of social reform. Mr. Guthrie's book, as I understand it, is not an attempt to present an exhaustive account of this movement, for as such it would indeed be open to criticism as omitting the writers of the earlier Middle Ages. But as an endeavor to give a general view of these doctrines from the time of More to the Revolution, it will undoubtedly serve a useful purpose. As such it forms another contribution to the general history of economic and social ideas which still remains to be written, and which never can be adequately written until the way has been prepared by monographs of which the present is a fitting type.

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
May, 1907.

PREFACE

ONE of the principal propositions maintained in this study is that many of the ideas of modern socialism, in its varied forms, were suggested more or less clearly, before the French Revolution, either in the writings of scholars or in the activities of the organized society of the period. The attempt is here made, therefore, to gather up and to systematize the early ideas and ideals from the most important sources, in order to ascertain what debt the present owes the past in this field of social thought. It is also contended that the conditions favorable to the growth of a socialistic theory and practice show themselves, to some extent at least, when, after the Reformation, the mediæval system gradually disappeared. Conditions of that time are therefore briefly sketched and the larger features of that environment set forth in which it is claimed the protest and propaganda of socialism took rise. An effort is also made to discover and set forth any more general, abstract principles which from time to time appeared and may be considered the philosophic basis and the logical justification for socialism. Moreover, the writings here analyzed will be found to yield certain

very definite, concrete theories, which, it is maintained, have been laid hold of by modern socialism and consciously or unconsciously appropriated. Furthermore, socialism, as here defined, will be treated, in both its method and matter, in its relation to social theory and interpretation. Attention will therefore be paid to the social ideas of the works examined as they form a part of, and take a place in, the development of social theories.

No attempt is made to discuss all the works appearing in the period here studied, which was rather prolific in this kind of literature; such an attempt would lead in this case, as it has done in so many cases, to a mere annotated bibliography.¹ Certain writers will be exhaustively studied in connection with those conditions giving rise to and aiding in the growth of their social ideas and ideals.

No apology is offered for a study of the revolutionary social doctrines of a period when it may be supposed very little of importance was written or done. A justification, if such there be, must lie in the fact that during this age appeared many works of a peculiar nature, which have been largely ignored, at least by English students. It may be further objected that such writings are not strictly socialistic, at least as that term is understood to-day. In an-

¹ Von Mohl, "Die Geschichte und Literatur der Staatswissenschaften," in *Monographien dargestellt*, Erlangen, 1855-58, 3 vol.

swer it may be said that this term as later defined comes nearer including this literature than any classification yet made of it. It is held that close generic relationship exists between earlier and later socialistic doctrines; though direct descent is difficult to establish and in many instances must rest upon presumptive evidence.

The author wishes to make grateful acknowledgments to Professor John Bates Clark, under whose instruction serious interest was awakened in social subjects; to Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman, under whom this work was carried on and whose counsel has been helpful at every point; and to Professor Henry R. Seager, whose kind suggestions made the way clearer.

W. B. G.

NEW YORK CITY,
May, 1907.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	I-53
SECTION	
1. Bibliography	I
2. Definitions	7
3. Socialism and Kindred Systems	10
4. Two Views of Society	17
5. Principles Common to Socialists	21
6. Academic Nature of Early Socialism	34
7. Schools of Socialism	39
8. Features of the Period Covered	43

CHAPTER II

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIAL UNREST IN ENGLAND

1. Thomas More the Central Figure	54
2. Facts of his Life	54
3. Historic Setting of "Utopia"	60
4. The Emergence of the "Social Problem"	68
5. Growth of Social Unrest	78
6. Reactionary Nature of Socialism	82
7. Decline of Asceticism	87

CHAPTER III

THE SOCIAL THEORIES OF SIR THOMAS MORE

PART I

1. General Considerations	92
2. Divisions of "Utopia"	93

SECTION	PAGE
3. Opposition to Enclosures	94
4. Discussion of Evils of Monopoly	100
5. Theory of Punishment	101
6. Theory of War and Peace	105
7. Attack on Private Property	106

PART II

1. Main Principle of his Theory	107
2. Communism of More	107
3. Social Advantages of Communism	110
4. Theory of the Family	112
5. Division of Labor the Basis of Social Organization	113
6. Length of the Labor Day	115
7. Theory of Pleasure	121
8. Theory of Social Organization	123
9. Theory of Goods	126
10. The City-State	128
11. The Socialism of More	129

CHAPTER IV

LIFE AND TIMES OF CAMPANELLA

1. Italy and Social Discussion	132
2. Place of Campanella in Literature	134
3. Intellectual Environment	135
4. Campanella, the Philosopher	144
5. His Conflict with Scholasticism	145
6. His Relation to Plato	151
7. Sources of his Theories	152
8. Jesuit Schemes	156
9. Jesuit Theories of Marriage	157
10. His Debt to the Jesuits	159
11. A Cosmopolitan Character	161
12. Political Tendencies	164

CHAPTER V

THE SOCIALISM OF CAMPANELLA

SECTION	PAGE
1. An Artificial Scheme	166
2. Labor Theory	167
3. Communism of Campanella	168
4. Theory of the Family	169
5. Theory of Leisure	172
6. Exchange in his Scheme	173
7. Political Scheme	174
8. Theory of Social Unity	176
9. Source of Economic Motive	181
10. Summary	182
11. Relation of Bacon to Campanella	183
12. Theories of "New Atlantis"	184
13. Followers of Campanella	187
14. Importance of Campanella	188

CHAPTER VI

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY RADICALISM
IN FRANCE

1. Biography of Morelly	195
2. His Literary Activity	197
3. Materialistic Tendencies of his Age	205
4. Statements of Morelly's Contemporaries	207
5. "State of Nature" Concepts	211
6. Absence of Historical Social Theories	215
7. An Age of Optimism	227
8. Goodness-Theory of Man	232
9. Theories defending Property	238
10. Attacks upon Property	242

CHAPTER VII

THE SOCIAL TEACHINGS OF MORELLY

1. Method of Morelly	248
2. Theory of Innate Ideas	251

SECTION	PAGE
3. Theory of Perfectibility	252
4. Environment Theory	255
5. Theory of Property	257
6. Problem of Supplying Economic Motives	261
7. Type of Social Organization	263
8. No Leisure Class	264
9. Theory of Distribution	265
10. Theory of Social Unity	268
11. Plan of Education	271
12. Estimate of Morelly	273

CHAPTER VIII


REVOLUTIONARY RADICALS

1. Emergence of Classes	276
2. Growth of Definite Ideas	280
3. Was there Socialism in the Revolution?	281
4. Theories of Boissel	282
5. Attack on Property	284
6. Theory of Distribution	286
7. Attitude toward Culture	286
8. Relation to Morelly	288
9. Babeuf—an Agitator	289
10. The Theories of Saint-Just	297
11. Attacks on Institutions	299
12. Teachings of Abbé Mably	300
13. Linguet	304
14. Barnave and his Theories	305

CHAPTER IX

General Conclusion	314
INDEX	333

**SOCIALISM BEFORE THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION**



SOCIALISM BEFORE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION:

A HISTORY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. There are in this as in other fields of thought several kinds of literature to be examined. There is, it may be said, a relatively small amount of original material that was written with a conscious socialistic bias. Quantitatively the original sources setting forth the thought of the times are, as compared with those more modern, of rather slight importance. Under the head of those works here called more or less clearly socialistic, chief stress will be laid upon the "Utopia" of Sir Thomas More, "City of the Sun" by Thomas Campanella, Bacon's "New Atlantis," and Harrington's "Oceana"; while the "Basiliade" and the "Code de la Nature," both by Morelly, will mark the close of the period.

There is, then, considerable literature from the pens of contemporaries which helps to an understanding of

these earlier writers and their peculiar views. Among these may be cited by way of illustration Latimer's "Sermons," Fitzherbert's "Farming," and the "Dialogues" by Thomas Starkey. In the later period reference will be made to the writings of Rousseau, D'Holbach, Helvétius, and kindred authors, as from them inspiration and suggestions were drawn by their contemporaries and also by later socialistic writers.

Amidst the vast amount of descriptive and historical literature bearing on socialism there is considerable touching this period. Much good historical work was done about the time of the downfall of the utopian school, or from about 1840 on for a decade. Among such writers stand Pierre Leroux,¹ who wrote with a strong socialistic bias, and Louis Reybaud,² who was as severely critical as Leroux was sympathetic. Two German writers have also left monuments to their extensive historical research: Von Mohl in his "Geschichte der Literatur" and Lorenz von Stein, "Der Socialismus und Kommunismus des heutigen Frankreichs." The historical investigation into the field of socialism begins with the opening of the historical school in economics, and had its development during the period when Roscher, Hildebrand, and Knies were

¹ Leroux, "De l'égalité," 1848; "De l'humanité," etc., 2 v., 1845.

² Reybaud, "Études sur les réformateurs ou socialistes modernes." 1856.

working in the field of historical economics. While the historical method was being applied to social study by the father of scientific socialism, Karl Marx, a new stimulus was given this historical writing by the stirring events of the early seventies, and for some years a considerable amount of literature appeared. In this work France leads, and the writings of such men as Adolphe Franck,¹ Benoit Malon,² and Janet³ show an increasing interest in the historical development of socialism. Naturally the work in historical lines increased as original investigations and theorizing subsided.

This period corresponds with the rise of the evolutionary philosophy, with the breakdown of utopian socialism, with the birth of scientific socialism, and with the revolutionary movements in England and France. In the nineties another group of writers began the historical investigation of early socialism. This period was marked by the appearance of the work of a coterie of German writers, among whom may be mentioned Eduard Bernstein, Karl Kautsky, Paul Lafargue, and others.⁴ Their extensive historical work did for the general field of socialism what this study

¹ "Réformateurs et publicistes de l'Europe." 1864-1893.

² "Histoire du socialisme depuis ses origines probables jusqu'à nos jours." 1879.

³ "Les origines du socialisme contemporain." 1883.

⁴ "Die Geschichte des Sozialismus in Einzeldarstellungen," von E. Bernstein, C. Hugo, K. Kautsky, P. Lafargue, Franz Mehring, G. Plechanow, 2 v., 1895.

pretends to do for a limited portion. As Reybaud had much earlier done in France, these writers traced modern socialism back to its more remote origins. During the following years much careful work was done on the history of socialism. In this connection it is probably true that the best work has been done in France. French writers are apt to show less bias for or against than the Germans. They are broader and more serious in their treatment than the Americans, while they are free from the narrowness of the English students. Among the French writers of first importance should certainly be mentioned André Lichtenberger,¹ whose careful and exhaustive researches into French sources have done much to illuminate the Revolutionary period and to set the parties and their principles in their proper perspective. He has also gone back to the period before the Revolution and discussed the theories contained in literature heretofore neglected, but which presents very much of interest to students of socialism in its historical development. The work of Frederick Engels in Germany deserves special mention for various reasons. In his "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," he has done valuable service in explaining the origin of modern scientific socialism

¹ "Le Socialisme au XVIII^e siècle." 1895. "Le Socialisme et la Révolution française; études sur les idées socialistes en France de 1789 à 1796." 1899. "Le Socialisme Utopique; études sur quelques précurseurs inconnus du Socialisme." 1898.

in its relation to German philosophy.¹ His close association with Karl Marx for nearly half a century specially fitted him to speak authoritatively on his doctrines and also to be critic and editor of the works of his master. The very suggestive study made by Anton Menger, translated under the title "The Right to the Whole Produce of Labor," should be consulted on the historical side, setting forth as it does the development of certain principles of modern socialism.² Miss Peixotto deals with the historical evolution of certain doctrines which have persisted to the present time, and by throwing the earlier theories into comparison with the later, she has made a most valuable contribution to the literature of historical criticism.³ Frederick Seeböhm has published a good work allied to the present study, entitled "Oxford Reformers," which deals with the origin of social discontent in England in the period following the Reformation.⁴ Of the literature discussing this particular period only a word will be said. Much has been written concerning the

¹ "Die Entwicklung des Socialismus von Utopie zur Wissenschaft." Berlin, 1891.

² "Das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsertrag, in geschichtliche Darstellung."

³ Peixotto, "The French Revolution and Modern French Socialism: a comparative study of the principles of the French Revolution and the doctrine of modern French socialism," 1901.

⁴ Seeböhm, "The Oxford Reformers, John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More." 1887.

"Utopia" and its noted author, Thomas More. Indeed, since its first appearance students have busied themselves with investigations concerning the author, his theories, and their place in history. Few have, however, treated More in his relation to, and significance for, socialism and its development. Professor Seeböhm has dwelt upon this side of More's work. Karl Kautsky has treated the social theories of More in an interesting volume, the best thing that has yet appeared on the socialism of Thomas More.¹ Of Campanella and his works, "Discourses touching the Spanish Monarchy" and "City of the Sun," it may be said that nothing has been written in English. Slight notice has been given him in French as in "Réformateurs et publicistes de l'Europe," by Adolphe Franck, but considerable has been written of Campanella in Italian. Much of this literature, however, deals with the philosopher only. Very little attention has been paid to Morelly or his writings; an obscure author, little known to his own age, his leading work attributed to Diderot for half a century, he was in a position to be neglected.

So extensive is the literature on socialism that any attempt at a complete bibliography would be to little purpose. Outside this brief reference the footnotes

¹ "Thomas More u. seine Utopie; mit einer historischen Einleitung." 1888.

must supply the citations on the particular aspects of the subject taken up.

2. Socialism as a system of thought and action, falling within the sphere of human activities, may be traced historically either as an actual social movement or as a development of a peculiar type of social theory; on the one side, it would deal with a set of concrete social facts; on the other, with a body of theoretical principles, a system of social thought. The distinction, therefore, should be made in this case that applies to the study of economic history and the history of economics; or to the study of politics and political history. The system of thought set forth in the masterly writings of Karl Marx who started as a communist and ended as a socialist; who began as a radical and became a conservative; ¹ who started as a propagandist and ended as a philosopher — his system might perhaps be called typically socialistic from the standpoint of theory.

Socialism viewed either as a social theory or as a practical system of social action means, in the large, the carrying the public or social control ever farther into the sphere so far occupied by the individual; it means the setting aside the so-called natural, social, and economic laws through the intervention of the social will operating consciously and in an absolute, sovereign

¹ The comparison here made has to do with the socialism of Marx and that radical and unreasoned communism of the prerevolutionary kind.

manner as against the individual will. That it has one class in view as against another seems not to be an essential to the concept of socialism. That the motive toward an enlargement of the social control would be apt to arise within the ranks of commonalty may be and probably is true; it does not at all change the nature of that social process called socialistic. That the masses in the lower strata tend to move in the direction of socialism merely means that there lies potentially the excess of power which is seeking a new centre of equilibrium in industrial spheres; as, in the political world democracy denotes the shifting the political power to a new centre.

It is natural to inquire whether there has ever been any realization of the scheme of socialism worth the name. Has there ever been any régime in human experience which might be called socialistic? Has the ideal ever been approached or does the discussion begin and end in the interesting but rather barren field of pure theory? Men have written, and most extensively, upon political doctrines; but back of these and to a large extent their source, from Aristotle down, has been the history of actual political society. Many theories of economic life have been advanced in more or less logical systems; these have been founded, however, in most part upon the facts of the economic process and have been attempts either to explain or justify it.

Proudhon defined political economy as a collection of observations thus far made with regard to the phenomena of the distribution and production of wealth. A history of political economy, then, is a record of men's subjective attitude toward a set of objective facts. Can the same thing be said of the history of socialism? Has there ever been a set of facts corresponding to the general theory of socialism, or is it merely a result of another attitude of mind assumed toward the normal individualistic economic order? It is here contended that socialism is largely an attitude of mind assumed toward the existing economic order. As a result of conflict there has been at times an approach toward the socialistic ideal. The final antithesis of individualism is socialism, and the form and process of human society, industrially considered, have gravitated toward one of these two poles. Never has society gone to absolute individualism; much less has any very perfect expression of the opposite been found.

Socialism, then, in so far as it has existed, has been a compromise, and it will probably never be more than this. Socialism is not an absolute fact to be attained and maintained; it is rather a method of social development — one side of a social process, and is hence a continual becoming. Bitter antagonisms have been and must be allayed; the larger conflict has ever been between the individual and the social will; and social-

ism, when it exists, will be found to be a synthesis of these two enduring antagonisms. Proudhon compares socialism to the god Vishnu, ever dying and yet ever returning to life; it has experienced within a score of years its ten thousandth incarnation in the persons of five or six revelators. Large inroads have been made into the field of private initiative and of individual control of industrial affairs. The whole area has never been covered by the control of organized society; neither is there much probability that it will be. A reaction is always sure to come before the extreme of either socialism or individualism is reached.

Socialism is, then, a phase and method of the historical development of industrial society. The term may be applied to either a process or a condition of society. Viewed and treated in the former sense, it becomes historical, matter of fact, scientific; considered from the other view point, it is totally unscientific, and theories concerning such a social structure are entirely utopian. Viewed in one way, the study of socialism reveals a very normal process of social evolution; seen in another light as a finished state of bliss and of social and economic quietism, it is imaginary, unhistorical, and totally impractical.

3. With these very general limitations stated, socialism may with profit be thrown into contrast with other systems of social thought more or less akin. Socialism

has been considered as a generic term. Of the types falling under this head, unquestionably the most important is communism.¹ Communism may be called an extreme type of socialism. It is a grosser, as it is an earlier, form of social organization. All early social structure seems to have been a form of communism.² It is therefore fitted to an earlier stage of industrial organization. Socialism is a refinement, fitted to a highly organized society. Its advocates have generally contemplated a society under the régime of capitalism. Socialism would so order industrial society and have the social will so control the economic process as to work a redistribution of the accruing product; communism would work a general redistribution of the control of all property — productive and consumptive. Of the two communism is the more simple and logical. An equal quantitative distribution of the material wealth regardless of problems of value is rather a simple and workable formula. Communism involves the attempt to solve the social problems by entirely abandoning the system of private property. It would shift the industrial structure to some other basis. It means a reversion to a more primitive society. Communism is the antithesis of the theory of orthodox economics. One sees a society with no private prop-

¹ Pierson, "Stadhuishoudkunde," p. 49.

² Karl Kautsky, "Vorläufer des neueren Socialismus," p. 3.

erty; the other rests its entire system upon the principles of private ownership. One would transform the state into an industrial corporation; the other sharply differentiates the state as a political organization. Socialism tends to reconcile these two opposites. It has opposed and ridiculed orthodox economics. It has been developed as an opposing theory to the *laissez-faire* doctrine and delights to reproach the do-nothing "Manchesterthum" of the English school. When separated from radical communism in France¹ in the later thirties and in Germany in the later forties, socialism becomes decidedly conservative and tends to shade off into schemes of reform in Germany, into a philosophic system under Karl Marx,² or a scheme of collectivism in France — in all instances tending to lose the native hue of resolution and become sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought or merged into the mellower light of philanthropy.³ As time passes, it is diverted into a variety of channels. In England trades-unionism rises on one side and land-nationalization on the other. In Germany the conservative element com-

¹ See works of Pecqueur, "Théorie nouvelle d'économie sociale et politique," 1842; and Vidal, "De la répartition des richesses," etc., 1846.

² Marx is still communist of a radical type till after the "Manifesto," 1847.

³ See schemes of Schultze-Delitzsch; cf. attacks of Lassalle on the proposed schemes of state banks.

promises and the schemes of social control help to weaken the cause of radical socialism in practice, while the "Socialism of the Chair" helps to spike the guns of the radicals from the standpoint of theory.

The constant tendency, therefore, has been for socialism to veer about toward a more conservative course, and an examination of the recent programmes of socialist congresses shows how socialistic sails have been set to catch new breezes as vast industrial changes have brought us into strange and untried seas. The short and simple propaganda of communism has grown into more extended proportions as into the programmes has gone a vast number of demands, some distinctly within, many falling very far without, the economic sphere.¹ Since the birth of collectivism in France, the tendency of socialists has been to deal with the productive side of the economic process. This was true of the collectivists. It is a fundamental principle of the massive labors of Karl Marx, to whose general socialistic theories the analysis of the process of value-production was vital, yielding the most important doctrine yet put out by socialism — that of "surplus value."

Other socialists, moderate and radical, have laid the emphasis upon the process of distribution. This was true of John Stuart Mill, who considered that the

¹ Kautsky, "Das Erfurter Programm in seinem grundsätzlichen Theil erläutert." 1892.

process of production was under the control of natural laws, but that the distribution of wealth was a social matter to be controlled by the social will.¹ Henry George made use of this proposition,² and the same attitude was taken by Lassalle in his conflict with Schultze-Delitzsch.³ Production was presumed to care for itself, if only the distribution of values were arranged. In contrast to their views the contribution of Professor Clark, showing that distribution is also amenable to law and is only one phase of the process of production, is most interesting and important.⁴

With the writings of Marx the demands of socialism are shifted to a very rational basis. He analyzed the productive process to see who produced the values. Marx, as is well known, decided that labor produced all "surplus-value" and should therefore be the only sharer. This proposition laid the basis in economic theory of the laboring man's socialism.⁵ Accepting the ethics of product, it made possible the basing of socialism upon justice and merit. This marks the

¹ "It is not so with the distribution of wealth. That is a matter of human institution solely."—"Principles of Political Economy," Bk. II, Ch. I.

² "Progress and Poverty."

³ Lassalle, "Herr Bastiat-Schultze von Delitzsch, der ökonomischen Julian; oder, Capital und Arbeit," pp. 13 *et seq.*

⁴ "Distribution of Wealth," Ch. I.

⁵ Sombart, "Socialism," p. 51.

theoretical separation of socialism and communism. Based upon the Marxian formula, socialism demands, not that all shall share alike, but that all shall share according to sacrifice; that is, that the laborer shall get the entire product of his labor.¹ Socialism, then, differs from communism in that it rests its claims upon the merits of labor, falls back to the ethics of product, and demands only justice.² Communism rests its claims upon the wants of its clientage and hence has a philanthropic and not an economic basis.

The connecting link between these two systems, both logically and chronologically, is Collectivism. In point of time it falls in with the decline of the radical communistic theories which were pretty much abandoned with the downfall of the school of Saint-Simon in the early forties. The new collectivist school was dominant till the rise of the later social thought with Marx, Engels, and Lassalle. Collectivism is a very moderate type of socialism hoping for a more equitable distribution of the product of industry through a socialization of the instruments of production. Collectivism, then, stands for the distributive process, as socialism goes out from the productive, and communism from the consumptive side.

There has long persisted, at least in the popular

¹ Menger, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

² Clark, "Distribution of Wealth," pp. 8-9.

mind, a tendency to confuse the terms "socialism" and "anarchism." None but laymen would make this error, yet the terms are often found linked together as if they had the same signification. Though in some of their premises there is a similarity, nothing is farther from the truth. Both systems advocate the abandonment of certain social forms which, they agree, are pernicious. Both systems make the welfare of the individual the test of the validity of social forms. Both are ultra-individualistic; they fall back to a state of nature where all have equal rights to certain things.

Socialism, however, deals primarily with the division of economic goods and starts out as an industrial system; anarchism has in view a political transformation. Socialism protests against that set of movements whereby wealth has gone over into centralized forms and against the so-called capitalistic method of production. Anarchism revolts against the concentration of political power in the forms of centralized and absolute governments. Democracy in industry to a certain extent meets the demands of one; democracy in government partially meets the theory of the other.

The practical tendency, moreover, of the two systems leads far apart. Under a régime where socialistic theories dominate comes a vast increase of the application of the public power. Instead of weakening government it has from the first tended to strengthen it.

Socialism in its development has placed more power in the public organs; it has widened the collective control; it has given to government enlarged spheres of action and limited the area of private initiative and control. Socialism holds to the importance of absolute power of government in an enlarged sphere and leads to an exaggeration of public authority; anarchism in an equal degree emphasizes the importance and the absoluteness of the individual. A recent writer has thus expressed it: "For the anarchist the betterment of society depends primarily upon the betterment of the individual; while for the socialist the betterment of the individual depends primarily upon the betterment of society." The complete realization of socialism presupposes the perfection of human machinery, and the complete realization of anarchism the perfection of human nature. Thus do socialism of the radical type and anarchism differ."¹

4. There are two general views of the fundamental nature of society which are pertinent to this discussion, whose origin is rather remote. One dates back to the philosopher Plato, and may be called the artificial view of society. This doctrine is set forth in his "Republic," which is the working out of his social theory under the domination of the concept of the Ideal State.² The

¹ Sanborn, "Paris and the Social Revolution," p. 168.

² Barker, "The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle," p. 81.

second theory of society goes back to Plato's great opponent, Aristotle, and may be called the natural view of society.

The teaching of Plato on the form and purpose of society is best set forth in his masterpiece, "The Republic." In this work, which contemplates a perfect commonwealth, Plato considers society as a self-conscious thing, capable of directing and controlling its own form and process by its own deliberate action. In other words, he taught the possibility and practicability of an artificial or an ideally constructed state — a Utopia of social bliss. Many writers have accepted the general principle above set down; such men as Aquinas, Augustine, More, Campanella, Harrington, Bacon, Hall, Fénelon, Morelly, and Rousseau — writers with whom one fundamental proposition may be discovered; namely, that society may control its own form and process. In other words, every theory of social welfare here called socialistic, which has appeared from Plato to Karl Marx, has been dominated by this view; has been under the guidance of the principle that society may be artificially constructed; that reformers may say, "Go to; let us construct a society."¹

¹ "Thus it is, then, that owing to our many wants, and because each seeks the aid of others, we gather many associates and helpers into one dwelling-place and give to this joint dwelling the name of city." — "Republic," Vaughan Edition, Bk. II, p. 54. "Now, then, let

According to Aristotle, however, the social will expressed through government cannot control the social institutions. If slavery exists, it exists because certain men are naturally slaves; while others are born to be masters; social relationships are determined in this natural and hence inevitable manner. In the theory of Aristotle man is by nature a master or by nature a slave; he is by nature rich or by nature poor. In the nature of things man is as he is, and on the nature of the individuals in society does the form of society depend.¹

Plato placed great confidence in the actions of the social will. He would trust the social mind in its conclusions as to the best ordering of human society. His theory is the opposite of that of Aristotle. It is the opposite of that philosophy upon which later political economy came to rest. It is denied by the teachings of the Physiocrats, to whom the natural laws were all important. It was contradicted by the "Laissez-fairists" everywhere. Plato's teachings conflict with the doctrines of classical economics where society was supposed to be controlled by the laws of its nature. His theory of society in this regard is refuted by the evolutionary theories of social science; it is abandoned

us construct our imaginary city from the beginning. It will owe its construction, it appears, to our natural wants." — *Ibid.*, p. 54. So in various places Plato emphasizes the possibility of establishing an artificial city. Cf. *Ibid.* p. 127.

¹ "Politics," Jowett's translation, Vol. I, p. 2.

by the scientific school of socialism led by Karl Marx, who goes over to the evolutionary idea of social progress.

The natural conclusions of the theory of Aristotle are classical economics, *laissez-faire* doctrines, individualism in industry, free competition, Manchester school. The equally logical outgrowths of Plato's idea of social control are seen in the mediæval control of affairs of church and state, monastic life, celibacy, clerical theories of political economy, utopian socialism, protective systems, mercantilism, and the many schemes of state socialism and public control which are offered as nostrums for all sorts of social ills. The period of Adam Smith may be said to mark the downfall of the extreme theory of social control which in one way or another had dominated thought since Plato; in politics it broke down earlier; in the realm of socialism it continued till Karl Marx, who abandoned this constructive notion and began the study of the operation of those social laws which control the process of social evolution.

Socialism, then, as here discussed, has this peculiar view of human society; it has a life philosophy, individual and social; it advocates the theory of social control as against the domination of individual ambition, selfishness, and rapacity; it opposes the *laissez-faire* theory and practice, and declares war on free competition.

5. In the search for unity in the thought of those writers who may be called socialistic, some difficulty is met with. It may be said that among the different shades of socialistic belief the lines of unity are more marked on the destructive side. Most socialists, of whatever color, naturally agree in attacking with about equal severity the existing order. Against certain features of modern industrial society — the wage system, free competition, the existence of the leisure class, and certain economic categories such as rent and profits — all socialism presents a united front. Along this line is to be sought the historical continuity of socialistic teaching. Whether or not the socialists have crystallized or can crystallize their thought into any positive system, they have at least been united in waging war on the existing social system. One thing they all proclaim, that, come what may, the present cannot endure.¹

It may seem like stating a truism to say that, as socialism is a doctrine of discontent, it has been a propaganda of the less advantaged class of society. It is true that in its modern phases socialism is a laboring man's movement, and its philosophy, the basis of which was laid in the theory of "surplus-value" by Karl Marx,

¹ "But seeing the masses are more easily united on negations, an immense revolutionary power must be ascribed to both." Menger, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

is a laboring man's philosophy. There is, however, nothing in the system of socialism to make it necessarily a lower-class movement.¹ The general attitude of socialism toward the problem of distribution is that the natural laws fixing the shares of the product of the industrial process, which are trusted implicitly by the *laissez-faire* school, are entirely untrustworthy. There must, therefore, be some external pressure brought to bear to more equitably distribute the social income. The extent or completeness of this social interference in the realm of natural economic law marks the varying degrees of socialism. There is, however, nothing in this general theory which attaches it necessarily to the lower or laboring classes.

Socialists have commonly recognized, since Thomas More, that the causes of social and political evils lie in the maladjustments of economic relationships. They all hold quite consistently that, with the existing capitalistic organization of society, wrong, injustice, inequality, and misery are a necessity and a natural and unavoidable outgrowth of conditions. With this system of industrial organization, social betterment is a vain hope. Palliatives there may be, but not a cure. This leads all socialists to the radical conclusion that reformation of the vicious system is vain and that hope lies only in its destruction. This was especially true

¹ Sombart, "Socialism," pp. 154-156.

of the earlier social theorists. To them the existing social organization was pernicious and unsatisfactory, producing normally social evil and unrest. Hence they propose to totally alter the social structure and so re-organize society that justice and universal social welfare would be its normal fruitage. The socialists have, then, generally believed that the present social system has been tried and been found wanting.¹ Socialism has this common feature marking its varied history. It has been a protest against the existing order. In the earlier period discussed in this study, it was against that type of industrial life that was hastening the disintegration of society, feudally organized, and taking its place. As Professor Foxwell says: "We may regard socialism as a protest against the extravagances of the individualistic movement of the Renaissance and the Reformation; against the disintegration of the settled order and inner harmony of mediæval life."²

Socialism has from the start attacked industrial society as thus organized on a basis of individualism. The struggle, therefore, opens when the forces of individualism begin to dominate. As the spirit of individualism, coming into existence with the Reformation, augmented and gained clearer and stronger expression, so grew the

¹ Cf. Kleinwächter, "Die Staatsromane," p. 20. Mackay, "A History of English Poor Laws," N. Y., 1900, p. 6.

² Introduction to translation of Menger's "Right to the Whole Produce of Labor," p. xxv.

opposing spirit of socialism. From the Reformation down to the period of Adam Smith it is vague and ill-defined; so is the opposing principle of socialism. With the coming-in of the individualistic régime, especially in the time of the classical economists in England and of the physiocrats in France, individualism becomes strong and aggressive, and socialism becomes a clearer system and its advocates active propagandists. After Adam Smith the two principles are more consciously appreciated, and the classes on either side are engaged in the social struggle.

Another common ground upon which socialists, earlier and later, can meet is found in their attitude toward private property. Private property, being the foundation-stone of modern society and a fundamental hypothesis in existing economic theory, is naturally a subject of constant discussion and an object of the cordial dislike of all writers bearing the title of socialist. The early schemes are largely occupied in discussing the abandonment of private ownership and a possible substitute for a social foundation. It appears evident from a study of the programmes of socialistic congresses and documents from the "Communist Manifesto" of Karl Marx to the programme of Erfurt or Hanover, modern socialism has not changed its attitude.¹

¹ See Kautsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 148 *et. seq.*

All earlier schemes for social regeneration assume a "man of nature." They propose to build society upon primitive principles. All radical social writers insist upon a greater simplicity in social life. One of the tenets widely accepted is that progress may consist in lessening social wants as well as in increasing productive power. This to a certain extent meets the charges often urged against socialism, that it threatens industrial efficiency and hence the amount of the product. The state of nature here conceived of is a condition of primitive perfection to be attained by a return to earlier conditions rather than through progress to reach a future state of social bliss. Early socialism had about the same idea of a primitive state of nature as had Pufendorf: "By the natural state of man in our present inquiry we do not mean the condition which is ultimately designed for him by nature as the most agreeable; but such a state as we can conceive man placed in by his bare nativity abstracting him from all the rules and constitutions whether of human invention or of the suggestion and revelation of heaven; for the addition of those assistances seems to put another face on things and to frame life anew upon an exacter model."¹ This sums up the ideas of a state of nature as held by the early social theorists. This theory is adhered to, directly or tacitly, from Thomas More to Rousseau.

¹ "Law of Nature and of Nations," Bk. 2, Ch. II.

Another feature very common to all the earlier and many later socialist doctrines is the emphasis placed upon the influence of environment upon individual and social life. This is of two kinds: social environment, viewed as the direct cause of social evil; and material environment, considered as a most potent factor in the formation of social and individual character. Socialism especially emphasizes the power of the social environment; and as by hypothesis the social structure is artificial and changeable at will, the radical socialists logically insist that the social conditions be totally altered. Evil is attributed to society and its vicious institutions; therefore society must be reconstructed.

Touching the despotic tendency of radical socialistic and communistic schemes, an appreciative writer says: "The system, the most authentic and absolute, is the system based upon communism; either before or after the invention of the word 'socialism,' especially those schemes patterned after Campanella, Thomas More, and the Moravian brethren. Those schemes that abandon private property are absolute in their nature."

Most of the early social schemes placed an absolute "prince" at the centre of their system. Illustrations may be seen in Erasmus' "Christian Prince," the "Prince" of the great Machiavelli, the supreme power "Hoh" in the "City of the Sun," Hobbes' "Leviathan,"

and Von Haller's "Usonia,"—in all the "prince" is idealized and given a place of commanding prominence. In government a monarchic plan is outlined; society is organized on the principle of a personal hierarchy.

A study of the early social schemes reveals the truth that they saw that a society without gradations was impossible and that where property ceased to be the principle of classification, it must rest upon a basis of personal distinction; and the schemes are marked by the fact of a personal hierarchy of the most absolute kind. All history bears evidence that the evolution of liberty has been closely associated with the evolution of private property. Personal relationships, from low forms of slavery up, have been relationships of servitude and tyranny; property relationships have brought about conditions of independence. Only two general types of social relationship can exist; one has a material, the other a personal, foundation. Systems rejecting private property have fallen back on the principle of personal allegiance. To this alternative all utopian schemes of social regeneration have been driven, and in the nature of the case they have been despotic. This despotic form of control and of social organization is common to all early socialism where property is abandoned as the basis of social organization.

Socialistic writers have not been so blind as to rob society of the common motive to industry and make no

other provisions. Under most schemes of socialism attention is paid to the need of motives to industrial activity. Socialists insist that motives arising from primary wants should and will displace those arising from secondary ones. Thus they oppose money and pecuniary gains as being unnecessary in the industrial process. The pecuniary motive would, then, be abandoned by socialists and no harm be expected. Socialists unite in opposing luxury and believe that industrial society can more nearly supply the wants of all its members by living in a simple rather than in a complex, luxurious manner. The demand for primary utilities would, they conceive, supply enough impetus. With the desire for distinction gone, many of the extravagant expenses necessary under the present system would vanish. All the desire and the cost of "conspicuous waste" would be avoided. All sharing substantially alike, the motive to effort arising from the class-struggle and competition would be avoided by society; but so would the corresponding waste. But if the motives to labor be somewhat lessened, the sacrifice of industrial effort will be to the same degree reduced; and labor becoming really a pleasure, the motive to toil will come from the activities themselves. As will be pointed out, this has been long emphasized, and Fourier was not the first one to dream of the possibilities of a laborer's paradise.

Consistent with the attitude taken, the early socialist was of a decidedly constructive turn of mind. The destructive effects of a communist propaganda require a theory of social reconstruction. A most cursory view of the growth of private property in its relation to social evolution will suggest what a large task rests upon the social theorist who would destroy private property and its kindred forms, and yet preserve orderly society. It is, however, undoubtedly true that society in the age of Thomas More and the whole early school of radical communists and socialists was [not so dependent upon the fact of private property as is the modern age. That less apprehension was entertained at casting it aside was very natural.

A most pleasing and equally groundless optimism marks most of the early socialist writings. This optimism rests upon a peculiar philosophy of life and on a boundless confidence in the possibilities of human nature. It also holds to the doctrine of the benevolence of nature and of natural law. Socialism seeks to relocate the causes of misery, not in nature, but in society and in its perverted institutions. In this fact lies its hopefulness. Not in natural and inevitable economic laws, as the "iron law of wages" or "Malthusian laws of population," or "dismal laws of supply and demand" — not in these lie the causes of evil and of misery, but in social environment and in institutions

which can be and should be changed, — here lies the root of social woe.

It was to the reconstruction of society, as thus conceived, that early socialism directed its attention. Along with this very hopeful view of the possibility of society if once properly organized goes an equally gloomy view of the outlook for existing society. Pessimism as to conditions, optimism as to possibilities, sums up in a phrase its attitude toward society. The socialist reverses the old adage to "Whatever is, is wrong," and records a violent protest against existing institutions.

Another feature marking all early social schemes is a devotion to a peculiar form of political and social organization — the city-state, with which was coupled the kindred notion of insularity. Most early social reformers hoped for social regeneration and betterment through the organization of closely aggregated social groups, self-sufficient and isolated. All the artificial schemes were patterned after the Greek model, the one Plato had in mind in his "Republic," the Greek city-state.¹ Conditions favored this in England in the age of More and in Italy in that of Campanella. In England cities were less developed, but Italy was the home of the city-state. Campanella naturally constructed his "City of the Sun" along the lines of mu-

¹ Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

nicipal organization. Around him were the declining "city republics"; while more remote, yet forceful, was the memory of the seven-hilled city on the Tiber. To the Italian, indeed, the problem of civilization had always been a municipal problem. Campanella shared in this belief.

Socialism has adhered to the idea of a social solidarity. This is hoped for through the establishment of equality, the rejection of the principle of individualism, the substitution of social-interest for self-interest, and the modification of the class-struggle. Socialism hopes to do away with industrial anarchy, allay the class-struggle, and to banish the savagery of competition. It has busied itself chiefly with the problem of distribution and has concerned itself less with production. Goods once produced are to be equitably distributed. It is the apparent unequal distribution that perplexes the socialist. "A better distribution of products would alone give all enough to eat. . . . The fault then if we have not enough to eat lies in the defective organization and is not due to lack of production."¹ These words express a common feature of socialistic doctrine.

Another feature very much emphasized as a peculiar contribution of socialism is the so-called economic or materialistic interpretation of history. Its main proposition is that history advances under the influence of the

¹ Jean Grave, "L'Anarchie, son But, ses Moyens."

strife of classes, whose struggle concerns the distribution of material wealth. According to Schmoller, the socialists are not responsible for the introduction of this type of historical interpretation; though they soon came to appeal to it in support of their socialistic propaganda.¹ After the great historians, such as Niebuhr, Thierry, and Guizot, had laid emphasis upon the class-struggle and its relation to historical development, the socialists took up the idea and have very much expanded it. From this they naturally arrived at a particular form of economic interpretation.²

The attempt will be made in a subsequent chapter to show that whatever may have been the later development of society along class-lines, based upon an economic difference, the early radical social teachings are largely free from the influence of this social classification, and there is no clear evidence of class-antagonism. It is here maintained that at the break-up of the mediæval system, English social history did not develop along any

¹ Schmoller, "Akademie der Wissenschaften," 1903, p. 1109.

² A very extensive literature has grown up on this subject. For a good résumé see article by Gustav Schmoller, "Akademie der Wissenschaften," 1903; also Vol. II of his "Volkswirtschaftslehre," Bk. 4, Ch. 2. Cf. Karl Kautsky, "Die Klassengegensätze von 1889," Pamphlet No. 4, Neue Zeit, 1889; Hans Müller, "Der Klassenkampf in der deutschen Socialdemokratie," 1892; A. Schäffle, "Kapitalismus und Socialismus," Siebente Abtheilung, 1878; Sombart, "Socialism," Chs. 3 and 4; Karl Marx, "Das Kapital," Einleitung; Bernstein, "Voraussetzungen des Socialismus," Ch. I.

narrow lines of class-conflict; but that much of both the theory and practice was concerned with the general social welfare viewed in its entirety. The same thing might be said of France in the period of Revolution when the legislation passed controlled all social classes.¹ While there were, during the earlier part of the struggle, no clear class-lines, toward the close the class-lines came to be distinguished and the struggle for the rights of man came to mean a struggle for the rights of the sans culottes.² A discussion of the class-struggle would, of course, involve a consideration of those much mooted points concerning the purpose and place of the guilds. The overemphasis of the idea of a class-conflict would doubtless lead to a serious misconception of these most important bodies.³ The view held here is that the guilds and the progress of early England advanced with little reference to a class-conflict. It is maintained that More's "Utopia," like Plato's "Republic," was a work on human welfare in its more general aspects. More, in his study of sixteenth-century society, made many

¹ Kautsky, "Socialistische Monatsheft," 1901-1902. Sombart, "Socialism," pp. 40-41. Cf. Lichtenberger, "Socialisme et la Révolution française," Introduction.

² See speech of Boissel quoted later.

³ For general discussion see: Webb, "History of Trades-unionism"; Brentano, "Origin of Trades-unions"; Howell, "History of Trades-unions"; Cunningham, "Industrial History"; Unwin, "Industrial Organization of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries."

valuable suggestions to later socialism; he did not, however, conceive of society from the view point of a class-struggle. What he did see was a gradual evolution of class-consciousness.

6. A large part of the discussion of socialism up to the work of Ferdinand Lassalle may be called academic.¹ All early socialistic thought was advanced by philosophic minds, and its influence was confined to narrow and exclusive circles. Until the famous appeal by Karl Marx to the laboring men, the socialistic principles and propaganda have been largely divorced from the general mass of the people. The self-help idea of the lower classes is a very modern idea.² The participation of the labor class in the movements of socialism is still more modern. Robert Owen appealed to the aristocratic element. His efforts were for the less advantaged class; it was not to them he appealed nor through them that he purposed reform.³ The French socialists of the first half of the nineteenth century organized schools, such as that of Saint-Simon; they did not organize the lower classes. Louis Blanc came nearer to it, though his was not a proletariat movement.

It may be asked why this form of idealistic and unpractical social theory so completely dominated the

¹ From 1859-1864 Lassalle was actively engaged in agitation.

² Active labor movements began in England about 1825.

³ "New View of Society." 1816.

earlier period of discussion. In the first place these theories were advanced when exact method was not developed and when literary form was much emphasized. Again, the literary romance is a convincing and insidious manner of presentation. The romance was, moreover, a form that gave greater immunity to the writers. Direct attack on existing institutions was not tolerated. Satires and romances enjoyed almost complete immunity throughout the period of despotism, both in England and in France.

Another fact to be noted is that social theorizing of this form marks the period of the romance of travel. These writings appeared when for the first time remote lands were being visited and explored. Primitive peoples were discovered and studied, all of which started new lines of social thought, fired the imagination, and gave food for the romancist. This was perhaps the first time since theorizing began that civilization had been thrown and kept in contact with barbarian life and culture. The Greeks knew the "Barbarian" or non-Greek; Latin writers portray peoples of strange manner and life; but they were not barbarians.

Literature of various kinds was stimulated by this new experience. For centuries it had depended entirely upon earlier and hence ancient culture for its models and ideals; from the classical age had come its impetus, and the Renaissance had brought its rich treasures from

ancient civilization. In this age not a classical but a new, primitive, uncultured world appealed to the imagination and awakened the fancy. This new culture gave suggestions on methods of social organization and of political structure.

Only a few illustrations can be given here from the field of literature. The romance¹ of Thomas More shows this new force in an interesting manner. The scene of his social study is the new western world. His chief actor is a seaman who had journeyed with America's first geographer. The people he takes as his model for social regeneration are simple barbarians. More idealizes these people, their simple virtues and effective social organization, and contrasts it with the England of his day. The use Swift makes of about the same set of facts is instructive. He falls under the same influence, but writes one of the most hateful satires that at once amuses and insults the reader. Mrs. Aphra Behn took the same set of conditions and idealized primitive man, giving literature that much used concept of the "good savage" (*le bon sauvage*). Rousseau borrowed this idea and adapted it to his purpose. In the writings of Hobbes and Locke the same evidence appears, and their illustrations are drawn from the newly explored area of savage life.

It is an interesting fact that the study of primitive

¹ Utopia, 1516.

man and the attempt to analyze him were accompanied by an effort to study more extensively the animal world. One led to a reëxamination of man himself and his spiritual possibilities, and had its results in an attempt to so readjust social institutions as to make them correspond with the new conception of what man was in his primitive state. The study of politics shows the effects of this new thought, and revolutions depended on it. Social schemes of reconstruction and betterment reflect the same force. The newly aroused study of animal life led to a study of the origin of species, the place of man in the realm of life, and the consideration of the evolution of higher forms of life. The former type of study was begun by Thomas More; the latter by Lopez and Pigafetta and continued by the modern students of anthropology and sociology.¹

It may be said, then, that this type of social thought and study was largely academic and intellectual. It did not affect the feelings nor appeal to the emotions. It did, however, affect men's minds. These writings were not fruitful in leading men to action; they were rather thought-breeders. The men they reached were not stirred to action by them; students were, however, to

¹ See John Pinkerton, "General Collection of the Best and Most Interesting Voyages and Travels in all Parts of the World." 1811. Cf. "Travels of Rabbi Benjamin," 1160-1173; "Remarkable Travels of William de Rubinquis, a Monk," 1253.

take them up and develop them.¹ The value of these utopian and romantic writings should not be underestimated. They awakened the fire of agitation, and the thought was widened and intensified and made effective in modern times. These writings have been arsenals from which modern social critics have taken weapons. Against the fantasy of poetry there is no effective economical argument.² These romances were the origin of new social ideals, without which a social revolution is impossible. Back of all attempted reforms have been held up those rosy, unattainable prospects.³

This type of literature, then, cannot be ignored. It forms too large a part of the social and political writings of the time and contains many rational, progressive ideas of reform. It should not be rejected simply because it does not present a logical dogmatic scheme. The social utopias and romances here studied teach social theory and induce reform by means of the concrete example. They set forth social ideas and clothe them with flesh and blood, as it were.

It has been pointed out that socialism has passed through three stages: the imaginative or romantic, the critical, and the scientific. What is dealt with here is

¹ Dowden, "The French Revolution and English Literature," p. 6.
Buckle, "History of Civilization," Vol. I, Ch. 1.

² Barth, "Der Sozialistische Zukunftsstaat," pp. 7-8.

³ Von Mohl, "Tübinger Zeitschrift," 1845, pp. 24 *et seq.*

largely the first or imaginative period. "Since the human spirit has been awakened to reflection, it has ever been inclined amidst all the puzzles and contradictions and needs of human life to create a harmonious whole in which all these difficulties are forever solved."¹

7. In the study of the history of ideas, chronology is not of first importance; however, so closely does social theory tend to correspond to actual social development that some attention must be given it. It is here maintained that one general type of thought is discernible from Plato to Karl Marx. There are certain underlying principles in which this unity is said to subsist. Within this larger area certain smaller divisions fall. The period of the classical writers finding its centre in Plato forms one conspicuous era. The second era, marked by the writings of the Christian Fathers, has been very much discussed as marking the opening of reasoned communism. A more distinct and fruitful period is included between the Reformation and the Revolution; this saw the formation of that form of industrial society against which modern socialism protests and has been chosen as the subject of this study. A developed form of socialistic thought, much after the earlier models, appears from the Revolution to Karl Marx. It has much color given it by the events and changes of the new machine age.

¹ Pöhlmann, "Geschichte des antiken Kommunismus und Sozialismus," Vol. II, p. 3.

The period chosen for this study covers about two centuries, and is treated under three general divisions of time. The first is the Reformation period, the centre of which is the work of Sir Thomas More. The second division goes out from Thomas Campanella in Italy and includes the agitation in England. The period preceding the French Revolution is treated last and has Morelly as its central figure.

The classification here adopted puts that very able group of writers that appeared after the French Revolution among the utopian socialists. These years were years of the most bitter disappointment. Countless things in the industrial world seemed to indicate that the Revolution had been barren of results. Reformers turned from the attempts at political betterment to a struggle to improve social life. This age is also marked by a return from an aggressive socialist propagandism to the literary type of social theorizing; it meant a return to the cell of the utopian and the dreamer. The first quarter of a century showed that tendency most clearly and all kinds of literature bear the stamp of social hopelessness. The bright optimism of the closing half of the eighteenth century gave way to the most gloomy scepticism.

With the French Revolution the climax of the most radical aspect of socialism was reached. There are many advocates of extreme communism after this time,

and the term "communism" covers this type of thought till 1848. Marx and Engels use it in their famous "Manifesto" of 1848. The term "socialism" was introduced in 1839. The grosser form of communism is modified at about this time. It takes the form of collectivism in the hands of Vidal and Pecqueur or goes over more to a political mould in the anarchism of Proudhon. In England literary and Christian socialism develop, and active agitation begins over land-nationalization. Scientific socialism came from the hands of Marx and Rodbertus, and radical social transformation and reconstruction were abandoned for efforts at amelioration of the Schultze-Delitzsch type.¹

This period is marked by an awakening of class-consciousness and the recognition of class-interests and a consequent class-conflict. Social reformers show this; the legislation of the time evidences it. Laws are carried through because of new class-alignments; a "bourgeois king" is put on the throne of France in 1830, and a proletariat republic is established in 1848. Political economists, such as Ricardo, point out clearly the classes that share and struggle for that share, in the distribution of wealth. This period was marked by the birth of the proletariat class and the opening of a conflict of the lower class on its own behalf. It saw the

¹ Cf. Laveleye, "Social Problems," p. 199; also Ruppert, "Das sociale System Bazards," p. 9.

disappearance of barriers to lower-class movements, permitting the organization of the laboring classes everywhere.

Following this period here called "utopian" is the appearance of scientific socialism. It begins when Karl Marx, after drawing much of his inspiration from the exponents of French radicalism, brushed aside their works of fancy and proceeded to study historically and critically the evolution of the industrial process for the purpose of showing that the existing forms must in the nature of things be transformed in a socialistic direction.¹ As this is not the place to discuss the problems as to the nature and origin of scientific socialism so called, only citations will be given touching this much mooted point.²

Scientific socialism depended upon two sources for its force; the evolutionary idealism of Hegel on one side,³

¹ Seligman, "Economic Interpretation of History," p. 26.

² "Von Babeuf welcher in leidenschaftlicher Weise eine radicale Umgestaltung der gesellschaftlicher Verhältnisse bezweckt hatte, gehen wir auf Saint-Simon über, welche dem Vernichtungsprincip der französischen Revolution das Princip rationeller positiver Reform entgegensetzte, weshalb seine Lehre auch als der Ausgangspunkt des wissenschaftliche Sozialismus bezeichnet wird." Ruppert, "Das Soziale System Bazards," p. 10. Cf. Booth, "Saint-Simon and Saint-Simonism"; Dühring, "Kritische Geschichte der National Oekonomie," p. 249; Menger, "Right to the Whole Produce of Labor," translation, pp. 83-84; Barth, "Sociologie und Philosophie," Vol. I, p. 23; "Saint-Simon Œuvres," Vol. XIX, pp. 81-84.

³ Engels, *op. cit.*, pp. 36 *et seq.*

the materialistic thought of Darwin and Spencer on the other. Ferri says: "Marxian socialism has triumphed, thanks to the work of Darwin and Spencer."¹

8. In explanation of the divisions chosen for this study, a few special features marking this period will conclude this introduction. In the first place, not only the conditions under which modern socialism could arise, but many of the principles of socialism in its more radical aspects begin to show themselves in the age of Sir Thomas More. It is equally true that the climax of this type of thought was reached in the French Revolution. This period is marked by a search for principles upon which the system of society based upon private property might be defended.² The period of the Revolution saw this type of discussion subside; saw the right of property strengthened and confirmed by being lodged in positive law and that established in France by the will of a democratic society.

As has been stated, this period was clearly marked by the theory that society is a thing not so much of nature as of reason. This is true, not merely of socialistic theory, but of political and economic doctrine as well. In the economic realm the system of mercantilism presented the conscious plan of state-making with an

¹ Ferri, "Socialism and Positive Science," p. 1. Cf. "Report of Society of Social Sciences," Jena, 1820; also Bonar, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

² In Chapter VI these principles are set forth at length.

economic basis. In politics the theory of the social contract teaches the peculiar rational element in the formation of the state and shows this period fitted for radical schemes of social reform. The logical consequences of this type of thinking are seen in the Age of Reason in France and its natural fruitage in the political experiments of the period of the Revolution. Two illustrations show the folly of radical schemes. One set of experiments is seen in the political sphere during the period of constitution-making in France. The other is seen in the economic sphere in the national workshops of 1848. Social reformers come to learn that man is by nature a political being. He is by nature rich or poor, employer or employed. They come to the opinion that, while the social will can in many ways direct social growth, it cannot remake society.

Another feature marking the period was the prominence of agrarian questions. The increase of capitalism and its many influences was apparent, but till the Revolution the dominant fact was agriculture; the leading questions were agrarian questions and the socialism may be called an agrarian socialism. England was prepared for an industrial type of economics in the time of Adam Smith and for the economics of commerce when Ricardo wrote; France, however, lingered much later in the agrarian atmosphere of physiocracy.

Problems touching the relation of industrial labor and industrial capital show themselves after the Revolution.

This period, moreover, was dominated chiefly by what may be called the economy of consumption. This holds true till the days of Adam Smith. He marks what may be called the beginning of the pecuniary age.¹ The idea of use-value had been more emphasized up to the time of Adam Smith who laid new emphasis upon exchange-value. The leading demand was for primary as opposed to secondary utilities. This phase is illustrated by a variety of sumptuary laws passed in England. One aspect of mercantilism, when certain articles of luxury were forbidden, displays the same attitude toward use-values. This same view will be brought out in discussing the writings of this age. Under such conditions it was natural that little distinction should be made between goods for consumption and productive wealth. There were two chief classes of goods, consumption goods and land. There has ever been a tendency, natural and hence persistent, to view land as common property; which has led easily to a demand for communism in land.²

Before the Revolution, there was lacking that larger

¹ Veblen, "Preconceptions of Adam Smith," *Economic Journal*, Vols. 13-14.

² Eden, "The State of the Poor, or an History of the Laboring Classes in England," Vol. 1, Ch. 1.

social unity of which social reformers had dreamed since Plato and which had been described by the Christian Fathers as a universal brotherhood. The growth of socialism or of socialization or even of class sympathy depended, first, upon a development of nationalism, and second, upon the wider spirit of internationalism. Social regeneration depended as much upon national unity as did political organization.¹ The influence of this lack of unity upon the larger social interests was clearly seen and forcibly put by Turgot: "Thus the various crafts become so many various communities of which the general community was made up. The religious brotherhoods, by tightening the cords that united the individuals in the same crafts, gave them more frequent occasions to assemble and to occupy themselves in the common interests of their particular society,—interests which they pursued with continued activity to the prejudice of the interests of society in general."² The possibility of this larger socialization depended pretty much upon the same fact as did the growth of internationalism. The underlying fact in both was the growth of the new capitalism.

It is a distinction so often made as to be trite that there are two general types of capital—trade and industrial capital. The dominant form of capital before

¹ Schmoller, "The Mercantile System," p. 47.

² Daire, Œuvres de Turgot, Vol. II, p. 304.

the Revolution, in the earlier part of the period here studied, was trade or commercial capital. The period following the Revolution was marked by an enormous expansion of industrial capital, which introduced an entirely new set of problems.¹ Now the larger significance lies in the form of organization which each of these favored. The marked tendency of trade capital was to develop the smaller groups; it was a great nationalizing force. Mercantilism, another term for nationalism, was engaged almost exclusively with commercial capital. It was in this connection that capital, that is, large accumulated funds, began to exercise influence in many directions. The large trade companies of Holland and England illustrate this.

In like manner has industrial capital been connected with the international or cosmopolitan doctrines.² This change of doctrine is first clearly seen in the teachings of Adam Smith, who discussed the economics of manufacture and industry. Along with the growth of this international aspect of capital came a widening of the sympathies of the laboring classes and a consequent broadening of the basis upon which social agitation could proceed and socialism come to rest. It was in 1847 when the famous Manifesto of Karl Marx sounded the keynote of the modern socialist struggle, that the

¹ See Pecqueur, *op. cit.*, pp. 565 *et seq.*

² Schmoller, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

startling call for union of laborers everywhere showed this struggle to be too large for national limits and the first attempt at international socialism was made. The narrow exclusiveness still regnant in the days of Turgot, this broad international aspect seen in the ill-starred "International" — herein lies part of the antithesis between the old and the new age.

The idea so much discussed in later literature, that labor is a commodity, does not often appear in the earlier writings. In the eighteenth century it is referred to in some such terms. Montesquieu says: "A man is not poor because he has nothing, but because he does not work. The man who, without any degree of wealth, has yet an employment is as much at his ease as he who, without labor, has an income of a hundred crowns a year. He who has no substance and yet has a trade is not poorer than he who, possessing ten acres of land, is obliged to cultivate it for his subsistence. The mechanic who gives his art as an inheritance to his children has left them a fortune that is multiplied according to their number. It is not so with him, who, leaving ten acres of land, divides it among his children."¹ Other rather remote references to this idea may be found. Locke approaches the theory, but does not state it. This aspect of the problem and its allied theories of the demand and supply of labor, etc., belong to the new age.

¹ "The Spirit of Laws," Bk. 23, Ch. 29.

Attention has already been called to the fact that the earlier age was under the economy of consumption; that the emphasis was laid upon use-values rather than upon exchange-values. This has been contrasted with the later principle that has been called the economy of production. Under such conditions it was natural that the literature before the Revolution should deal with the right of the laborer to subsistence; while after the Revolution the notion of the right to labor should develop.

The attempt to establish the time when the claim was first made of the "right to labor" will not be made here.¹ The dominant theory before the Revolution was the right to subsistence; soon after it the new idea of the right to labor makes itself felt and heard. The claims of modern socialists of the right to labor, of the "right of labor to the full product," of the right of society to the "unearned increment," and of the exploitation of labor by capital through the taking of the "surplus-value" — these ideas are not clearly set forth in the earlier period.

In the theory of the right to subsistence, distribution is made upon the basis of wants and leads to the most radical communism. The theory of the right to labor while making radical demands upon society would distribute goods according to services rendered; it

¹ Menger states it was first advanced by Fourier, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17.

demands, however, that each be given the opportunity to labor.

The theory of the right to subsistence appears in many different forms during this earlier period. Locke, in his "Two Treatises of Government," states it as follows: "Whether we consider natural reason which tells us that men, being once born, have a right to their preservation and consequently to meat and drink and such other things as nature affords for their subsistence; or, Revelation that gives an account of those grants God made of the world to Adam and his Sons; 'tis very clear that God, as King David said, hath given the earth to the children of men; given it to Mankind in common."¹ He further says: "This I dare boldly affirm, that the same rule of propriety, viz. that every man should have as much as he can make use of, would hold still in the world since there is land enough in the world to supply double its inhabitants."

In the writings of Pufendorf the same reasoning may be found. He considers the right to subsistence a corollary to man's existence. "Since that God Almighty hath conferred on man the privilege of life, he hath at the same time supposed to have allowed him the use of everything necessary for the keeping and maintaining of that his gift."² Rousseau and

¹ "Two Treatises of Government," Part II, Ch. V.

² "Law of Nature and Nations," Bk. IV, Ch. III.

Montesquieu both hold that society owes all that are born into it the means of subsistence. The same thing may be said of those writers more closely examined in later chapters. Examination of the English law during the period here studied will show that the government acted upon the principle that all members of society have a right to subsistence. This was an underlying principle of the English poor-laws from Henry VIII down. Not nature, but society decides that there is a place at the board for every member of society.¹

As opposed to the later theory of the right to labor, the duty of laboring was emphasized during the poor-law period. The connection between this duty and the right to subsistence was clearly appreciated. Many of the so-called poor-laws were vagrancy laws and contemplated the enforcement of this duty on the "sturdy vagabond." The modern problem of a lack of labor is less prominent in the earlier times. Idleness was viewed as a crime and the leisure class a menace and a burden to society. To-day the demand is that the upper-class labor; earlier the opprobrium of idleness attached to the lower-class alone. The more developed theories of the right to labor showed themselves when the natural rights philosophy had given rise to a whole group of rights supposed to inhere

¹ Cf. Malthus, "Essays," 1803, p. 5.

in the individual, the existence of which needed no further evidence than the glittering generalizations of the metaphysicians.

Few had based these rights of labor upon the theory that labor was a type of property. Locke puts it quite clearly. "For this labor being the unquestionable property of the laborer, no man can have a right to what that is joined to."¹ This is the clearest statement of the property quality in labor so far made. In the period of the "natural rights" philosophers appear statements of the right to labor based upon man's inherent right. "The right to labor is a natural right. It has been infringed by ancient institutions, but their infringements have been justified neither by time nor by public opinion nor by the acts of authority which seem to have sanctioned them."² Beginning with the Revolution, the principle of the right to labor is clearly recognized. The practical expression is seen in the national workshops of France of 1848.³

In the earlier period the social protest lacks definiteness; it is general, vague, and visionary. With the Revolution came a decided change. It became a class-struggle. It meant the struggle of one class to get property that belonged to another class either through

¹ "Two Treatises of Government," Bk. II, Ch. V.

² Daire, *Œuvres de Turgot*, Vol. II, p. 306.

³ Menger, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-26.

actual revolutionary violence or through proposed changes in the method of distribution.¹ The earlier utopian socialism, Marx says, "belonged to the head of theorists."² It had no class-organization back of it. These early theories were embodied in the programme of no party, had the sanction of no congress, were defended by no conferences. The earlier writers had no more sign of a "school" than had Bacon in science or Rousseau in politics. Their projects, like the dreams of equality and liberty in the minds of liberalists, were many of them mere vague ideals in the minds of philosophers, some to be forgotten, others to go on into later systems of social thought.

Partaking of the peculiarities here outlined, this earlier type of thought had great revolutionary possibilities. It was ready to break totally with the past, which is the essence of revolution. This earlier social theory rested upon an unshaken confidence in the masses. It was ready to undertake a radical reconstruction of society because of an unlimited confidence in the goodness and perfectibility of the ordinary man.

¹ Villey, "Le Socialisme contemporain," p. 4.

² Sombart, "Socialism," p. 106.

CHAPTER II

THE BEGINNING OF SOCIAL UNREST IN ENGLAND

1. An idea has been gained in the preceding chapter of the attitude taken toward certain of the economic problems in England during the incipency of the capitalistic era. The government tended to push itself far into the sphere of private industry, attempted by law to offset the influence of competition, and also to control and limit the power of monopoly. The new problems thrust before the public by the gradual passing of the old and the coming of the new age were met by a set of regulations at once detailed and comprehensive. The widening of the control over the lands of England by private holders, introducing all the evils of "Enclosures," had called forth a very extended interference of the state with the property-right and illustrates clearly the subjection of the individual to the demands of the social will. Briefly, these main facts have been set forth as a prelude to a discussion of the first socialistic theorist, Sir Thomas More.

2. As the purpose of this essay is not biographical, only brief notice will be paid the famous author of "Utopia." Thomas More was born in London in 1478 and died on the scaffold in 1535, a victim of the

intolerance and despotism of his royal master, Henry VIII. As a young man he was intended for orders, but later drifted into the law, in which profession he excelled. He held a variety of political positions of honor, being finally called to be the successor of the fallen Wolsey as Lord Chancellor of the realm of England in 1530. Disagreeing with the king over the Catholic question, he was charged and convicted of high treason for his refusal to take the oath of supremacy and was beheaded in the Tower. Thomas More, twice married, was survived by four children, some of whom contributed to his biography.

There is little dispute as to the high place More holds among the great scholars and statesmen of his time. One of the strongest evidences of his genius is, of course, the "Utopia." The second feature worthy of mention is his intellectual environment. More's associates were the ablest, most brilliant men of the Renaissance age. He was in the closest intimacy with Colet and Erasmus and somewhat less familiar with Linacre and Grocyn,—men who would be an ornament to any age and in any country. He was not only companion but also adviser to the king when the greatest minds, not only of England but of the Continent, graced the royal capital. He appeared amid those great intellectual characters whose glory added fame to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Nor was More

one of the lesser of this illustrious group. The opinions of his contemporaries show this. Seebohm says: "Whether it was thus at Oxford that Colet formed his high opinion of More is not known, but certain it is that he was long after wont to speak of More as the one genius of whom England could boast."¹ These early scholars literally fell in love with him. Of him Erasmus said, "A readier wit than he had ever met." Later writers pay equally flattering compliments to the genius of the great humanist.

Thomas More was one of the brightest lights of the Renaissance age. He was typical of what was best in an age when southern culture was transforming northern manners. "More represented the highest perfection discernible among the men of the Renaissance."² The place More occupied in the state testifies to his peculiar political power. His first place of prominence was in the House of Commons as its youngest member. So powerful was his influence that he was feared by the king and finally driven out. His success before the bar needs no further evidence than the fact that he was followed by Linacre and Grocyn and the famous men of his time.³

¹ Seebohm, "Oxford Reformers, John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More," London, 1887, p. 25.

² Lilly, "Renaissance Types," p. 309.

³ Seebohm, "Oxford Reformers," p. 143; cf. Roper, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

Of the book which is made the subject of these chapters the translator and critic of the "Republic" says: "The 'Utopia' of Sir Thomas More is a surprising monument of his genius and shows a reach of thought far beyond his contemporaries. In the first part the element of pessimism prevails largely. He sees, as Plato did, the extreme misery. To the eye of More the whole world was in a condition of dissolution and decay."¹ The "Utopia" was translated into several languages at a time when printing was young and classical literature and the brilliant writings of Renaissance Italy were pressing themselves upon the reading world.²

¹ Introduction to "Republic," Jowett's translation, p. ccxxi.

² Several editions of his famous work "Utopia" have been edited at different times. It first appeared at Lyons in 1516, one year before Luther's advent in Germany. A second edition appeared in Louvain in 1518. In 1551 it was translated from the Latin into English by Ralph Robynson. This translation, made almost in the generation of More, was so superior that since then it has been the standard and is still quoted as the most authentic. The second English edition appeared in 1557. "Utopia" was put into Italian in 1548, appearing in Venice. It was translated into French in 1550, and into Spanish in 1636. Portions of the "Utopia" were printed in Brissot's "Bibliothèque," Vol. 9, 1772, the same volume where may be found Proudhon's famous dictum, "Le Propriété est vol." Of recent editions one by T. F. Dibdin is well edited. This edition is quoted in this essay. A good reprint appears among "English Reprints," edited by Edward Arber, London, 1869, Vol. 1. The most widely known is the John Morley edition. Few books have been so fortunate as to be translated into so many languages and to be so widely read, losing so little in freshness after the passage of nearly four centuries.

More's "Utopia" embodies the social and political thought of a great scholar and profound student of social affairs, written at a time when few were seriously theorizing on social problems. During leisure snatched from the business of a foreign embassy, he conceived the notion of embodying his social and political ideas in the description of the imaginary commonwealth — "Utopia."¹ Of the "Utopia" Budæus said to Lupsetus: "We owe to Thomas More the discovery of 'Utopia,' for he hath divulged to the world in our age a pattern for a happy life and perfect behavior. This age and our posterity will have this history as a seminary of most wholesome doctrine and from which they may transport and accommodate every one to their own cities and kingdoms these excellent ordinances and decrees."² As a contemporary Paludanus says of "Utopia" in a letter to Peter Giles: "You may see in 'Utopia' as in a looking-glass whatsoever belongeth to a perfect commonwealth."³ "But the book that carryeth the prize of all the books is 'Utopia.' He doth in it most lively and pleasantly paint forth such an exquisite platform, pattern, and example of a singular good commonwealth, as to the same neither the Lacedæmonians nor Athenians nor yet the best of all the others, the Romans, is comparable."

¹ Seebohm, *op. cit.*, p. 337.

² Cresacre More, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

³ *Ibid.* p. 50.

Of the literary style of the book little need be said. At the opening of English historical prose More displays a fine literary taste. The "Utopia" is considered a fine piece of Latin prose. Of him Jowett says: "More was gifted with far more dramatic invention than any one that succeeded him with the exception of Swift. In the art of feigning he is a worthy disciple of Plato. We are fairly puzzled by his manner of mixing up real and imaginary characters."¹ "Thomas More is marvellous in every respect; for he confoundeth most eloquently and translateth most happily. Nothing is hard, nothing is rugged, nothing obscure. He is pure, he is elegant."²

The "Utopia" has great value as a piece of history, dealing with the events which its author saw in process about him. It is important to note that More was really the first English historian; annalists and chroniclers there had been, but no historians. This better qualified him as a social critic, and this feature in itself gives the "Utopia" a substantial worth. "One trustworthy record we have; one that has ever been appealed to as authentic; as giving an unbiassed estimate of the miseries that were endured by the poor and of

¹ Plato, "Republic," Jowett's translation, Oxford, 1888. Introduction.

² Letter of Beatus Rhenanus, quoted by Cresacre More in "Life of Sir Thomas More," London, 1726, p. 21.

the waste and pomp of the rich.”¹ The importance of such pieces of contemporary literature as the “Utopia,” “The Dialogues,”² “Book of Surveying,”³ and the like cannot be easily overstated. Their references are not numerous nor their descriptions lengthy. There is, however, an air of genuineness about them that is convincing. “‘Utopia’ is worthy of multiformed study, not only from its reflection of the character and ready wit of its author; from its proposed solution of such social problems as overpopulation, its prevention, and the like, but also for its reference on the conditions of the poor, especially of the ‘bondmen,’ the then dying-out villeinage of England.”⁴

3. A remark worthy of note on the history of this type of literature is its relatively small amount as compared with certain other types. The two centuries contemplated by this study do, indeed, present many illustrations of a spirit of unrest and of protest against the existing social and economic order, and perhaps the expressions are freer and the changes suggested more radical than in other spheres. There is, however,

¹ Preface, “Dialogues of Starkey”; see below.

² Thomas Starkey, “England in the Reign of King Henry the Eighth,” a dialogue, etc. Early English Text Society. Extra Series 12.

³ Fitzherbert, “Boke of Surveying.”

⁴ Arber, “Reprints,” p. 4; cf. Erasmus Letter to William Cope; “Papers and Letters of Henry VIII.”

a very meagre and fragmentary literature. In comparison with those writings which may be classified as political the other seems very insignificant. One need only think of the voluminous works of Hobbes, Locke, Grotius, and the like to observe how the religious-political and not the social-economic concepts dominated the time. The economic view of the world-order had indeed not dawned. The treatment of social problems and of economic facts is far more unsystematic and veiled in the garb of fiction and romance than are the political treatises.

As this study is an attempt to gather the earliest suggestions of socialistic doctrines from the thought and practice of the incipient stages of capitalistic production, a brief inquiry into the antecedents and the immediate environment of the thought of Thomas More, a set of events of considerable influence on social thought and leaving no slight mark on literature in general, will now be made.

Among some of these influences of actual though of uncertain weight was the discovery of new lands and of primitive peoples. It seems true that the discovery of the new lands and the subsequent exploration of the Americas put civilized man in close touch with primitive culture for the first time. Many illustrations may be found where different grades of culture met. Tacitus had studied and in his works

described the German tribes, the "forest-children"; but these were quite far along before the degenerate Romans were given moral lessons, with their simple virtues as examples. Here, however, a return to nature and an imitation of simple manners and purer morals were suggested, much as they have been by comparatively modern writers. Marco Polo interested mediæval Europe in remote peoples with his magic stories of the dwellers in the far Orient; he described a people, however, probably older and more cultured than the populations he addressed in his descriptions of Tartary and the Far East. But with the discovery of America, the civilization of Europe was brought into touch with barbarism. Then it was that primitive peoples were made a subject of thought and the study of ethnology began.

The influence of this new thought and of the habits and institutions of these primitive peoples was direct and marked upon Thomas More. The opening of the narrative in "Utopia" shows this. Raphael Hythloday, into whose mouth More puts the most important dialogue, was a native of the commercial country, Portugal. He relates how, hoping to gain knowledge of strange, remote peoples, he had joined himself to the explorer Amerigo Vespuce. It was, says More, on a voyage to the new world that those suggestions were gathered as to the proper ordering of a state which

is so graphically described in the constructive part of "Utopia."¹ The work of More is one of the earliest to show this influence, and the age of discovery stimulated his fancy. He was the first to take the newly discovered primitive peoples and their institutions and their simple ways as a field for social study and a model for a possible regenerated society.² Like Saint Augustine he saw ancient civilization and its ideals going into decay about him. His was an attempt to call people back to the earlier culture, to a simple life. More's "Utopia" was the first and best romance of travel.

To the literary antecedents and environments of Thomas More greater interest attaches. Of these sources unquestionably the most inspiring was the

¹ The French tended at first to idealize the American aborigines. As illustrations, see the "Voyage de Bourgainville"; the plays of Mrs. Aphra Behn and kindred writings; to her is credited the term and concept "Le Bon Sauvage." The English attitude, so different, is seen in the writings of Swift; his satires are a bitter attack on mankind in general. Of course this difference in attitude is seen in actual social relationships. The French have freely intermarried, the English did not.

² This type of teaching and writing marks the beginning of that method which developed into that introspective study of the pre-revolutionary period in France. It was an attempt to study man in his primitive and hence in his supposedly essential and unchanging qualities. This trend of thought was revolutionary in the extreme. Why preserve social conventions and government if happiness and goodness were both found in primitive conditions among savage folk? Cf. Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

"Republic" of Plato. Plato was the intellectual father of socialists as well as of philosophers. His "Republic" was the model on which most later artificial social schemes were constructed. It furnished not merely the form of social control, but it also, as has been remarked, determined the manner of exposition. More's "Utopia" has, however, a large element of originality in it.

It is in many ways unique. The general notions of the two men differ widely. Plato had a more general abstract end in view, he was seeking an explanation of abstract justice; More was interested in the practical solution of actual and present social problems and busied himself with plans to alleviate existing unfortunate conditions. He was busy examining the widening gap between rich and poor, and believed it possible to so organize society as to avoid the threatened evils. "More wishes to devise a system in which the poor shall not perish for want nor the rich be idle through excess of their riches."¹

Of the same type of work was the "Republic" of Cicero. This work is far less idealistic. Cicero was a lawyer and a man of affairs, resembling Thomas More; while Plato was a dreamer, poet, and philosopher. Hence, Cicero's social writings are matter-of-fact and

¹ Arber, "English Reprints," p. 5.

practical, dealing with the details of political structure and of the governing bodies instead of treating the more abstract principles of social life and organization. As with Plato and More, property and its validity and utility are discussed, but far more superficially. In Book IV, § 5, Cicero refers to Plato's scheme of communism, which he condemns. He comments on the extreme idealism of Plato and criticises the "Republic" as shadowy and imaginary. With far less attention to the ideas of reform, Cicero sets before him the task¹ of treating the historical development of an actual commonwealth. Cicero discusses in a cursory manner a state of nature where man once dwelt without sin and fault in a state of perfect equality. He holds that the rise of social institutions brought inequality and many social wrongs.²

Another book bearing resemblance to More's "Utopia" is by the more famous author, Saint Augustine, "The City of God."³ "The City of God" was written upon the final capture of Rome by the barbarians and was inspired by the extreme sadness and by the unspeakable loss occasioned by that calamity. It was written when, to all appearances, civilization had failed and was about to be extinguished. Written by the great monk to defend the Christian teachings, the book presents a

¹ Bk. V, Ch. 2-3. ² Bk. V, Ch. 2. ³ "De Civitate Dei."

most interesting picture in contrast with the unfortunate scenes that surround the writer. "He sits, as it were, amid the ruins of the City of Rome and beholds a vision of the City of God descending from Heaven, the new Jerusalem, which was to take the place of the worn-out social organization which has succumbed alike to the will of God and the violence of men."¹ As an attempt at a philosophy of history, "The City of God" reveals the perfect social state as one where love and holiness rule instead of the false system set forth in Pagan philosophy.

Later writings of a similar nature which mark the close of the scholastic era stimulated More. These earlier writers were not as conscious of the problem as was Thomas More; in fact, it had not taken so clear a form.² Some writers who preceded More in England, as John Ball and Langland, seemed to have grasped the problem and to have seen the large economic factor in the social and ethical questions which forms one of the corner-stones of socialistic philosophy. What they treat in poetry, More treats in a more matter-of-fact manner in his prose works. The books by Erasmus³ are highly satirical, and are not comparable to the "Utopia."

¹ Preface to "The City of God," by F. R. M. Hitchcock, p. ix.

² Among these writers fall John Wyclif, Machiavelli, Erasmus, and the like.

³ "Praise of Folly," "Christian Prince"; cf. Gibbins, "English Social Reformers," p. 1.

Such were some of the sources from which Thomas More drew suggestions and inspiration. Few had so far discussed the social situation in its economic aspects. Writers had appeared who dealt with various sides of economic life.¹ Others had discussed the problem of property;² the prince had been dealt with in connection with the control of the commonwealth;³ references had been made to poverty and its evils (in poetry);⁴ society had been bitterly satirized for its foibles and follies;⁵ violent attacks had been made on the social order.⁶ None, however, had taken so broad an outlook on social life; none had displayed such keen insight into social problems nor given so sane judgments nor seen so clearly the economic causes of social evil as had the great humanist — Thomas More. He displayed a power, rare in any age, of looking out of his environment and beyond his time. He was gifted with the capacity to see that another and better condition of society was possible. He realized he was not in the best possible world and produced a scheme which he believed would allay social unrest. About him were appearing new social conditions and their problems, of which it was natural to inquire the meaning. The formation of classes, the constantly widening gap be-

¹ Nicholas Oresme.

² Wyclif.

³ Machiavelli, "The Prince."

⁴ Ball, Langland, Chaucer.

⁵ Erasmus, "Praise of Folly."

⁶ Huss and the Bohemian Revolt.

tween rich and poor, the accumulating evils of poverty, were growing only too apparent. These constituted conditions inviting the study and making their demand upon the ingenuity of the philosopher and of the practical statesman.

4. Back of every socialistic propaganda, and underlying every radical social movement, will be found three facts: There must exist, in the first place, social inequality and apparent abuses and wrongs. There will, again, be a certain class, more or less conscious of these conditions; while in the third place there are required philosophic minds to observe the conditions, to point out causes and the way to a remedy. These conditions existing, reform or revolution is very apt to ensue. Socialism, then, will flourish in proportion as the consciousness grows that there is something vitally wrong in the industrial organization of society.

The appearance of "Utopia" marks the beginning of the modern social problems as they show themselves in the incipient stages of the capitalistic period. Social movements may be detected as the old order is passing and the new order is appearing. This new period is marked by the growth of distinct and self-conscious classes. This development of classes, whose lines of cleavage are economic and industrial, forms one of the most important social features of that age and marks what has already been pointed out as being a chief

feature in modern socialism — the opening of the “class-struggle.” The mediæval society with its peculiar structure and self-sufficient groups with their narrow interests gradually yielded to a wider social unity.

This period also witnessed the attempt to more and more centralize and socialize control through the regulations of the general government. The relations of these classes slowly coming out of the dissolving feudal society; the conflicts they wage in the industrial sphere; the powers each is to gain in law and the position they are to hold in the customs of the land — these now begin to show themselves as vital factors in the social problem.

The date of this evolution of a class-consciousness and the appearance of recognized class-interests may be placed in the fifteenth century. This marks rather definitely the transition from the mediæval into the modern period. The earliest assignable date for the appearance of this process of differentiation is that of the “Great Plague,” in 1348.

There are, it may be remarked, three very commonly accepted divisions of industrial society. These three, the land-holding, capitalist, and labor classes, arising from the inherent nature of the industrial process, have been accepted as valid divisions of society, whose interests are very clearly antagonistic. The Plague

did very much in England to bring into clearer view the lines separating these classes.

The "Great Plague," visiting England in 1348-1349, carried off about one-half of the population. It came to England at a time when the agricultural interests were still of first importance. The event occurred, however, when the feudal system had been so far disturbed as to make the landlord-class quite dependent upon a separate labor-class. The immediate effect of the plague was to produce a scarcity of labor, which fact showed more clearly the place the laborer had filled in society. It precipitated, in an acute form, one of the problems of the modern day — a bad distribution of labor both between localities and among the different industries. The laborers, taking advantage of the scarcity of labor, asked for increased wages. The landlord-class and its interests then appear in direct antagonism to the interests of labor and of the laboring class. Legislation was enacted to keep wages down.

At this time also appears the capitalist-class with its peculiar demands. The conflict of interests of the landowners as against the capitalists appears in their competition for that labor which before had been employed on the land. "The landowners began to fear their lands would not be cultivated and were compelled to buy labor at a higher price than would have been

given at a time when the necessity of the laborer to the capitalist was more obscured.”¹ The “Statute of Laborers” is one of the earliest and most noted instances where a legislative body was called upon to solve the rate-of-wages problem. Here was the state interfering with the economic law, according to which scarcity would cause a rise in price. In this case may be found many of the features of modern conditions. Here was unity of purpose in a class — the struggle for higher wages. Labor also was becoming more mobile, to be controlled by subsequent legislation. These laborers, gradually growing into a class, were at the same time being freed from the land with its benefits and its limitations.

What took place in France during the Revolution and in Prussia after the battle of Jena,² occurred so much earlier in England. “The class of free laborers and tenants and laborers who had commuted their services were oppressed, and the ingenuity of the lawyers who were employed as stewards on each manor was exercised in trying to restore to the landowners that customary labor whose loss was now so severely felt. The result was a gradual union of laborers and tenants against landowners and employers — the beginning of a social struggle in which we recognize the

¹ Gibbin, “Industry in England,” N. Y., 1898, p. 153.

² Marking the humiliation of Prussia, 1806.

unfortunate modern tendency of a hostile confrontation of labor and capital." ¹

In this process of segregation of classes, the increase of large farming played an important part. This change in the nature of farming led to a vast increase of laborers who gradually became detached from the soil and separated from the tenant class.

Two leading facts tended to produce this result. In the first place the growth in the size of the farms led to an increase of stock-farming or of the application of the capitalistic methods to agriculture; in this case large amounts of capital were invested by the holder with the result of giving a large employment to wage-labor. This led to the growth of an independent labor-class and also a type of agricultural capital dependent upon this same labor-body. The type of extensive farming was largely devoted to pasturage, and thus a less demand for labor was created than existed under intensive cultivation. Thus there was a larger body of free labor than the existing industries could absorb and there followed, what so frequently follows invention and radical industrial changes, a class with no land and no market for their only commodity, — labor. For the growth of this separate labor-class meant the growth of a body of men with nothing to sell but their labor,

¹ Gibbin, *op. cit.*, p. 154. Cf. Jessop, "Coming of the Friars," N. Y., 1889, pp. 254, 256.

and this in a time when, to an ever increasing extent as feudal institutions vanished, some equivalent must be offered for a share in the social wealth.

More and more through the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were the old feudal and manorial relationships breaking down. Slowly the personal bonds which held servant to master, through a recognition of mutual duties, were being weakened, and the money relationship was taking their place. Through commutations of various kinds and in many spheres the "cash nexus," as Carlyle called it, came to displace the milder, more humane, domestic relationships of the earlier times. As these classes grew wider, there appears a horizontal stratification of society; "Feudalism was an aggregation of local groups."¹ This type of organization must vanish before any class-organization could appear. With the break-up of this feudal organization from the time of Richard II, the way was being cleared for a new classification. Employer and employed, landlord and tenant, laborer and capitalist — these new terms creep into the parlance of the times, and these new classes slowly appear above the surface.

A feature of this period very early discernible is the passing of dispossessed tenants and laborers over into a permanent class. This condition is necessary

¹ Cunningham, "The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times," Cambridge, 1892, pp. 338, 339.

to any effective social movement. Where conditions are such that the members cannot move into a higher nor sink to a lower sphere, there is possible a class solidarity, and effective social agitation may follow.

Among the causes operating in the age of More and which were effective in producing conditions of social unrest, none was more important than the "enclosures." It was this social change, going on so rapidly in the time of More, that he so bitterly condemns, and for which he seeks a remedy in law. The general attitude toward enclosures is cleverly put by an eighteenth-century pamphleteer:¹ "The enclosures of commons and common-fields has not been more deprecated by one set than by another. The landowner, seeing the great increase of rent made by his neighbor, conceives the desire of following his example; the village is alarmed; the cottager not only expects to lose his commons but the inevitable consequence of a diminution of his labor, being obliged to quit his place in search of work." The important fact here noted is the separation of the laborer from the land with the increase of that class whose members have no land nor access to any. "I have seen some small farmers in enclosed places, starving with their families till necessity had

¹ "The Advantages and Disadvantages of Enclosure of Waste Land," *A Country Gentleman*, p. 36.

driven them to quit their farms and betake themselves to labor."

Of the different types of enclosing, that of the commons caused the most hardship and was most productive of a landless labor-class. It was against this form of enclosure the most complaint was made and that led to the protest and opposition of Thomas More.

The rate of enclosure differed widely in the two periods. "It was most rapid in the periods from 1470 till 1530 and from 1760 to 1830."¹ Ashley throws the emphasis on the earlier period. "The period may be defined more definitely as that lying between 1470 and 1600; with the understanding that during the first sixty years, from 1470 to 1530, the transformation was far more violent."² During this period it was the common land that was in question, whose enclosure was most effective in creating social unrest.³ The loss of this land was of importance to the laborers who, while earning wages, had also rights on the commons.⁴ The evils of enclosures had been most apparent with that growing body of half-dependent, wage-earning class

¹ Gibbins "Industry in England," p. 215.

² Ashley, Introduction to "English Economic History and Theory," N. Y., 1894, Vol. II, pp. 286-287.

³ Warner, "Landmarks in Industrial History," London, 1899, p. 139.

⁴ Prothero, "Pioneers and Progress of English Farming," London, 1888, p. 21.

that was just passing over into a lifelong propertyless labor-body. "The two classes that eventually suffered most were 'common field farmers,' to use the eighteenth-century description, and the cottagers or emancipated serfs, who had no share in the agrarian community, but lived as hired laborers supplementing their wages by keeping cattle on the rough pasture."¹ Up till the close of the fifteenth century not many laborers were doomed to a life of labor with no by-industry. There had been at their disposal a certain amount of land where at least their cattle might graze. "We are not to conceive of these laborers as a body of men in regular employment at fixed wages; the number of permanent laborers on the demesnes seems to have been small."² When, however, the process of enclosures had progressed, these half-laborers, half-farmers, robbed of their right to the common lands and deprived of the labor furnished by the farmers, must leave the condition of cotters and join the proletariat class.³

The effect of this process was to develop this class of labor, free from the obligations of feudal times, but leaving the laborers without the support and protection then insured. "The various 'Statutes of Laborers' which from this day appear on the English statute books were a confession that the day when the lords of the manors could require the personal services of their

¹ Prothero, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

² Ashley, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

³ *Ibid.*

tenants in return for the lands they held, had gone.”¹ It was from this class of dispossessed cotters and half-dependent laborers that the ranks of the poor were swelled and a body of vagrants created. It was this condition that called forth those laws for the betterment of the labor-class in the reign of Henry VIII and subsequently. It was English society, marked by some such features, that formed the field of study to Thomas More.

It has been remarked that the discussion of modern socialism is chiefly concerned with the method of production known as capitalistic.² Socialism, having to do with the distribution of surplus-values, produced under a complicated system of division of labor and function, giving rise to both personal and functional distribution, must of necessity contemplate that vast increase of capital upon which division of labor depends and which so complicates the industrial process. The age of More witnessed a very great growth of industrial capital. As has been intimated, capital was accumulating not only for purposes of trade and commerce as evidenced by the organization of trade companies;

¹ Denton, "England in the Fifteenth Century," 1888, p. 113.

² The importance of the study of the early English conditions as an introductory study in socialism will appear clearer when it is remembered that from this field Marx drew his material for his system.

capital was also being applied to agriculture and to manufacture.¹

The flowing of capital into these channels had certain results on labor already pointed out. It had, furthermore, the effect of converting agriculture from what may be called subsistence into capitalistic or profit-making farming. This meant that where before there had been an intensive culture for home-consumption there now developed extensive culture for the market, this also growing more extended. This, in turn, led to a profit-making farming-class, and to the creation of a surplus-value to go to swell the fund of capital, instead of going, as previously, to the support of a more crowded laboring population on the farms. Thus came about the growth of capital, saving the surplus-value on one hand, and driving away the cotter-class into vagrancy or into a propertyless labor-class on the other hand. Here the modern socialist philosophy and protest could take its rise. At this point the historical socialism of Karl Marx can be said to begin. Here the capitalistic exploitation, if such a thing exists, may be first noted in English industrial history.

5. It is not strongly insisted that the first condition necessary to a social revolution, *i.e.* the existence of a class keenly conscious of social wrongs, had very far

¹ *Economic Review*, Vol. 6, p. 28. Cf. List, "Das Nationale System der Politischen Oekonomie," 1845, Ch. I.

developed in England by the age of Thomas More. It may be safely urged, however, and certain facts in evidence have been presented, that such a class was in process of formation and that thus early are the incipient stages of a class-struggle along economic lines. The second condition laid down above also was presented; viz., the hardships and misery more or less obviously connected with social injustice and wrong. As a mouthpiece of this voiceless class, Thomas More looked out on certain evils in English society, the chief of which will be here briefly portrayed.

The rapid displacement of the cottier population through the process of enclosures, produced an abnormal quantity of free labor and led to the impoverishment of the cotters. This fruitful cause of discontent and social unrest had been operating for a century, but it had become much more active during the lifetime of More. Laws were passed against this evil, and in favor of those most injured in the process; but these had been largely evaded or ignored, and the injury increased as time went on. The laws point out the process of enclosures as the "decay of the people"; it had turned many poor laborers into vagabonds; it turned the peaceful cottier out of his home and compelled him to seek labor elsewhere or to join the increasing army of beggars.

Fitzherbert in his "Book of Surveying" discusses

the hardships of sixteenth-century life arising from the enclosures. He relates how in the olden time the condition of the cotter was so much better; then all the land lay in common and undivided as pasture. "Then was their tenement much better chepe than they are now; for a most part the lords hath enclosed a great part of their waste grounds and straitened their tenants of their commons therein; also they have enclosed their desmesne lands and meadow and kept them in severalty so that the tenants have no commons with them therein."¹

The complaints became loud and bitter. The attempts at a remedy through the statutes were ineffective. Attacks were made on the landed aristocracy in much the same spirit that the modern socialist condemns the greed of the capitalist. One took the form of an agrarian uprising; the other produces an industrial disturbance. An advance of wages to offset the effect of the enclosures would have been suitable remedy; this did not find place and in the transition great hardship, it seems, was endured. "But during the busy seasons of the year a score or two of men and women would be engaged; and the wages then earned would be an important addition to the produce which they

¹ Scrutton, "Commons and Common Fields, or the History and Policy of Laws relating to Commons and Enclosures in England," Cambridge, 1887, p. 79.

gained from their small plots and from their rights of commons.”¹

A second feature in the situation deserves emphasis here. The course of events that had brought about the enclosures had the further effect of raising considerably the rents and also of driving up the level of prices. “With the demand for land and the almost universal rise of prices came an increased rent; the small freeholders and those that lived by the plough found it harder and harder to gain a living; the poor men who relied upon the commons for the grazing of their one cow saw it surcharged by the sheep of wealthy graziers, enclosed by rich nobles for their sheep farms, or converted into a park for their deer.”²

On the problem of the actual change of wages that occurred at this time, no definite statements can be made. The continued researches made by eminent scholars into the history of wages and their variations have brought forth very little that is conclusive. The problem becomes too complicated with so many variants. The rate of wages, unit of payment, value of money, length of day, standard of prices, and, finally, the standard of living of the time varying as they do, a definite solution is scarcely to be expected. One thing seems certain, that no rise of wages took place commensurate with the losses experienced by the less advantaged

¹ Ashley, *op. cit.*, p. 267. ² Scrutton, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

classes. Despite the attempts at betterment, the petitions sent in for legislation and the good intentions of the Tudor monarchy, conditions grew worse during the last half of the fifteenth and the first half of the sixteenth century.¹ It was some such conditions, then, that met the eye of Thomas More and suggested the "Utopia," the first work written in the modern age that saw the roots of social evil reaching the soil of economic maladjustment.

6. It is a contention of this thesis that socialism in many of its phases and as presented by its earlier advocates is at once a revolutionary and a reactionary system of thought. It will be shown in a later chapter that the fundamental principles of eighteenth-century socialism were deduced from a study of the qualities of primitive man. The strongest defenders of the communistic features of socialism fall back to the conditions of primitive society where, it is contended, the right of property did not exist.² The same habit of mind is here attributed to Sir Thomas More. He was in many ways a decided reactionary. He looks rather to the past than to the future. He seeks rather to return to the simple, happy past than to reach an ideal future. The place of More, then, can be best appreciated by noticing his relation to the large, progressive move-

¹ Cunningham, *op. cit.*, pp. 348-368.

² Kautsky, "Vorläufer des neueren Socialismus," Einleitung, p. 1.

ments then in process about him. His work will be seen as one of restoration rather than of construction. The first writer who broke with the past and was constructive was Campanella, a forerunner of the later constructive reformers.¹ The attitude of More, in this respect, may be studied in relation to some of the very significant facts of his day,—the growth of private property, the Revival of Learning, and the Reformation.

As has been indicated, More was one of the bitterest opponents of enclosures, then so limiting the use of common lands in England. Complaints had begun to be loud and bitter by the opening of the sixteenth century, and More joined in the protest, not against the illegality, but against the social wrong of the enclosures.² He hoped to stem the tide of economic change that had set in toward a capitalistic method of production and a more individualistic system of property control.

The process of enclosures was only one of many phases of the evolution of the system of private property. This meant the destruction of communal rights and the coming-in of individualism with a vengeance. From this point of view one can understand More's tendency toward communism. He stood out against the radical social changes in structure and in industrial method

¹ Franck, "Réformateurs et publicistes de l'Europe," Paris, Vol. II, pp. 6-7.

² Denton, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-161.

which were going on about him. He wished a return to an earlier, and hence a simpler, form of social life. He was in favor of the milder, more humane spirit of manorial control where "every rood maintained its man" and "health and plenty blessed the laboring swain." More advocated a return to the communal rights of the cotter system. He also favored limitations on the introduction of capital and encouraged the development of agriculture.

The position More took to the mighty religious movements of his day displays also his conservative spirit and his regard for tradition. Regarding the Reformation, More was an ultra-conservative. He remained a devout Catholic, refused to acknowledge Henry VIII as head of the Church of England, and suffered martyrdom for his course. Against this religious innovation he was as reactionary as he was regarding economic changes. The Reformation meant the breaking down of feudalism on its religious side, and More opposed this change with vigor.¹

More's attitude toward the New Learning seems at first sight rather inconsistent. He was a most devoted advocate of the Renaissance, and was chiefly influential in leading Henry VIII to introduce the classics and classical culture into England. The New Learning had,

¹ Tulloch, "Leaders of the Reformation, Luther, Calvin, Latimer, Knox," Edinburgh, 1860, p. 308.

however, showed such tendencies and been so opposed by the church and the conservative element that More's ardor in espousing the new movement seems strange. In Italy it had led to a new type of infidelity and a denial of the Catholic faith.¹ In Germany it had stood opposed, not alone to the Catholic power, but to religious faith itself.² In England it had been opposed by the clerical authorities and by the councils of Oxford and Cambridge, and was only introduced through the efforts and influence of such men as Linacre, Colet, and Thomas More.³

When More had come to power and influence in England, learning had ceased to be merely a handmaid of the church and had come to have a broader cultural purpose.⁴ Of this type of movement More was one of the most important popularizers and patrons. He saw in it no enemy of the church nor of religion. He saw in the Revival of Learning a new force for the enlarging and enriching of life. The chief feature of the Renaissance was the return to ancient models. The Revival of Learning meant the reversion of Europe's best thought to the ancient classics and the ancient civili-

¹ Seebohm, *op. cit.*, p. 368.

² Paulsen, "Geschichte der Höheren Schulen Deutschlands," Einleitung.

³ Einstein, "Italian Renaissance in England," N. Y., 1902, p. 44.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

zation. In this, as in other instances cited, tradition dominates the mind of the great humanist.

There was nothing, therefore, inconsistent in the support More gave the Renaissance and his opposition to the Reformation. He did not desert Christian for Pagan principles. He did not ally himself with Machiavelli and his theories to the denial of the ethics and politics of the Christian Fathers. Neither More nor his close associate, Erasmus, accepted the ethical nor the political conclusions of the new doctrine, but were in direct opposition to the Machiavellian school and rebuked the attacks on Christian morals. The case is well stated by Seebohm: "And possibly it may have been in some measure due to their efforts that a century later, Hugo Grotius, the father of international law, was able in the name of Europe to reject the Machiavellian theory as one that would not work and to adopt in its place the Christian theory as the one that was sanctioned by nature and upon which it alone was safe to found the polity of the civilized world."¹ More sees and presents the place of religion and morals in the social scheme; instead of abandoning these forces, he is the first writer of a purely social treatise to make emphatic their importance in social life. He sees society as a result of the blending of the two great forces, the

¹ Seebohm, *op. cit.*, p. 369.

Christian and the Pagan, which had come down from the classical age.]

In relation to these great movements, then, More was a decided reactionaire. He opposed the Reformation because he believed the church should be reformed from within and not from without. "The next agents were the Humanists or reformers who, like More, Erasmus, and Colet, were content to reform the church from within, to purge away the grossness that had been contracted by the cunning and superstition of long ages and to attempt the splendid utopia of a purified church, founded along the old lines, with a spiritual Cæsar at its head who would be a Christian Aurelius, a virtuous, wise, and paternal monarch who might counsel and guide the soul of a regenerated Christendom."¹ With the utmost sincerity More turned his attention backward toward classic models and to the literature, art, and manners of the past.²

7. The last important feature here noted in the environment of More is the decline of the controlling and regulating influence of the church. For long centuries the church had exercised a softening influence on the lives, actions, and ideas of men. It had fostered that

¹ Thorold Rogers, "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," London, 1894, pp. 382-383.

² Lilly, "Renaissance Types," p. 319. Kautsky, "Thomas Morus und seine Utopie, mit einer historischen Einleitung," *Internationale Bibliothek*, Vol. 5, p. 24.

spirit of asceticism which played so large a part in preserving the peace and order of Europe. It had constantly turned men's minds from the material to the spiritual. It had enjoined men to lay up their treasures in heaven. Under this influence the hold on property had been in many instances weakened; in others abandoned. The spirit of Christian charity stood opposed to the growing pecuniary spirit; and self-abnegation to selfishness. For centuries the church had taught men to deny themselves temporal gains that spiritual blessings might be secured. It had inculcated the spirit of brotherly love, which, in the nature of the case, did much to soften the struggle for existence. Monastic life, though perverted, had taught its lessons, and through canon law and precept had checked the spirit of rapacity. Inequality and poverty had, in the earlier times, not the power to arouse the unfortunate, nor develop unrest into revolution. The poor were either given aid to alleviate their sufferings, or were, through the promises and consolations of religion, reconciled to their lot.

While poverty was considered a blessing and self-denial a cardinal virtue, there would be no social problem nor conflict of classes. The change in belief came about the time of More. It was induced by great transformations in the industrial world. It was hastened by the influences of Humanism and of southern

culture. When, through the Reformation, the church lost its power as a religious force, it also declined in political and social spheres. "The moral suasion of the church in protesting against slavery, in securing the weekly rest for the serf, or of seeking the welfare of the pilgrim was no longer the chief factor in introducing improved conditions for industry and trade."¹

Many evidences might be given of the decline of this ascetic spirit so marked in the later Middle Ages. The teachings of John Huss in Bohemia furnish the most striking illustration. The new theory showing itself at this time taught that poverty was an unnatural condition; that to be poor was a misfortune; that to produce such conditions was an act of injustice and oppression. "But he [Huss] also won over the common people by preaching that the goods of the clergy were the goods of the poor, by which the latter ought to be maintained, and that poverty was an evil only tolerated by God and for which the wealthy classes were responsible."² No clearer denial of the old doctrines can be found than the teachings of Huss in Germany and no more marked expression of its effects. When abnegation had come to mean only a duty of the poorer laymen while the opulent clergy grew ever richer; when the

¹ Cunningham, *op. cit.*

² "Und die Kirche, die grosse ausgleichende Macht früherer Zeit, war unter allen habsüchtigen Gewalten die erste." Stern, "Die Socialisten der Reformationszeit," Berlin, 1883, p. 6.

clergy had ceased to be shepherds of the flocks and came to be wolves to devour the sheep; then had the church itself abandoned its earlier pretensions in thought and action and led to a general break down of its influence.

In England near the close of the fourteenth century occurred the famous Peasants' Revolt. Many causes have been given of their ill-starred attempt at revolution; unjust taxation with new forms of discrimination, cruelty in collections, and kindred abuses seem to have helped to cause the uprising. It is natural, however, to seek a theoretic basis for this as for other social revolutions. The ideas which had inspired the rebellion both in England and in Germany were laid at the door of Wyclif. Out of the church itself came these revolutionary theories and they were not of an economic nature in the beginning. They began rather in religious heterodoxy. "We can readily understand how Wyclif's adversaries could point to these events with a malicious satisfaction, and give out that these were the fruits of his destructive opposition to the doctrines and institutions of the church and especially of the itinerant preachers who went about everywhere stirring up the people."¹

As a result of this decline of old ideals the age of More was marked by the appearance of a new test of

¹ Lechler, "John Wyclif and his English Precursors," London, 1878, Vol. II, p. 223. Cf. Kautsky, "Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation," London, 1897, p. 45.

welfare. It saw a rapid growth of material wealth and well-being and the multiplication of worldly pleasures. This spirit is quite evident in "Utopia"; it can be seen in other writings; it evidences itself in the laws of England in the period of the Tudors directed against luxury. "Material prosperity is in short Machiavelli's idea of the chief conscious basis of political life among men. How far this conception is from that of the ancient philosophers, that the state is an institution devoted to the moral and intellectual uplifting of the community, and from the mediæval notion that the end of the state is primarily to smooth men's way to eternal salvation, it is not necessary further to demonstrate."¹

More's "Utopia" takes this same view of life and of the state. In this it typifies later socialism which contemplates the conversion of the state into an economic and industrial agency. It is hoped that industrial conditions may be equalized and improved through this change. This means to transform the state from a political and civil into an industrial organism. It is the realization of the German idea to change the police state (*Polizei-staat*) into the cultural organization (*Kultur-staat*). The state is still to work out justice; but under the conception that justice and injustice are economic and not civil categories.

¹ Dunning, "History of Political Theories, Ancient and Mediæval," N. Y., 1902, p. 306.

CHAPTER III

THE SOCIAL THEORIES OF SIR THOMAS MORE

PART I

1. The "Utopia" merits careful analysis as one of the earliest expressions of the consciousness of social wrong and a complete scheme for social reorganization. It contains the criticism of a great philosopher on the industrial and social changes marking the opening of the age of capitalism.¹ It is a commentary on existing society, full of keen criticism, severe satire, and wise suggestion. No clear lines are drawn between political and industrial problems. It deals, as did the works of Plato, with the broad problems of human welfare and the best means to their solution. The "Utopia"² is a clear reflection of English society during the period of the great Tudor king. More makes his arraignment of society the more severe by throwing it into contrast with the ideal commonwealth of "Utopia." He attacks society both in general and in particular. He condemns those institutions from which seem to

¹ Marx, "Capital"; Aveling, English edition. "The modern history of capital dates from the creation in the sixteenth century of a world-embracing commerce and a world-embracing market," p. 123.

² More, "Utopia." References are made to edition of 1878 by T. F. Dibdin, Boston.

emanate social wrongs. He shows the evils of low wages and the oppression of rich employers. He denies property rights in general and its forms of money and land in particular. He rebukes the ruling class for their personal laxity and for their severity and cruelty to others. Existing conditions deterrent of human welfare are condemned whether in church, state, or in society at large. Under the transparent garb of fiction, abuses prevalent then, as now, he bitterly satirized. Certain principles of social and political theory are set forth with a clearness and insight which make much modern criticism seem ancient.

2. The work on "Utopia" is divided into two parts, designated as Books I and II. The first part, Book I, is relatively short and is introductory to the major part found in Book II. Its purpose is largely critical, though it abounds in suggestions of possible reform and has many references to the land of Utopia, set forth with great skill, with the view to awakening interest in the constructive material to follow in Book II. On every page is revealed the consummate skill of a writer attacking the existing institutions of an intolerant age with all the latitude it permitted. The critical or destructive part is highly practical and suggests the far-sighted statesman and keen critic rather than the utopian dreamer.

The second or constructive part of the work is of

necessity more theoretical and in some instances presents situations highly impractical and quite incredible.

✓ This is natural, as it is in their positive and constructive plans that all social reformers are liable to the severest criticism. Rodbertus, so sane and practical in the field of criticism, becomes even fantastic in some of the schemes he proposes. In the last of his economic letters to Von Kirchmann he makes predictions and advances ideas which ill comport with the credit given him as the father of scientific socialism. How natural to expect, then, in the writings of the father of utopian socialism, plans that are very fanciful and which tend to shake one's faith in the severe sense of the great Humanist.

3. As has been stated, one of the largest questions connected with the early stages of the Industrial Revolution concerned the Enclosures. It had in essence to do with the share labor was to get in the process of distribution. Farming was to many a laborer simply a by-industry. A source of revenue was thus cut off by enclosures. Moreover the revolution was silently effecting other great changes, with one social class — the landlord-class; it was lessening their income, and this in favor of another — the capitalist-class.

To this matter More, in the beginning of "Utopia," addresses himself. ✓ He sees in the growth of sheep-culture and in the process of enclosures, with the at-

tendant decrease of wages, a social wrong, an economic error, and a political danger. Nowhere in the literature of the time can be found a more vivid picture of the course of this economic movement in England than the following: "Forsooth, my lord, your sheep that were wont to be so weak and tame and so small eaters; now as I hear say become so great devourers and so wild that they eat up and swallow down the very men themselves. They consume, destroy, and devour whole fields, houses, and cities. For look in what parts of the realm doth grow the finest and therefore dearest wool, there noblemen and gentlemen yea and certain abbots, holy men no doubt, not contenting themselves with the yearly revenues and profits which were wont to grow to their fore-fathers and predecessors of their lands, not being content that they live in rest and pleasure — nothing profiting — yea much noying the weal-public — lease no ground for tillage; they pluck down towns and leave nothing standing but only the church to be made a sheep-house." ¹ Thus More sets forth one of the fruitful causes of social unrest and of individual hardship. He condemns in bitter terms those who, by one means or another, drive out the helpless tenant and laborer; "when men, women, husbands, wives, fatherless children, widows, woful mothers with babes, and the whole household small in substance but great

in numbers" are driven out into the world and upon society, without means of maintenance to swell the beggar and criminal classes. The first analysis of the problem is made from the standpoint of the menace arising to society from the increase of the criminal and beggar class.

It was, in fact, from this social standpoint that More considered the rapid industrial changes. Not only does it affect the civil state of society, but also bad economic conditions arise. The new system brought enlarged profits to the monopolists and More saw in it an evil to society at large. "It throws many men out of employment, whom no man will set to work, though they never so willingly proffer themselves thereto. For one shepherd or herdsman is enough to eat up that ground with cattle to the occupying whereof about husbandry many hands were requisite."¹ More sees and sets forth what in a later period so many writers and opponents of the machine saw, a period of transition when labor was, in the nature of the case, displaced and made to suffer until readjustment brought relief.

In More's mind the industrial progress of his time was a foe to the laboring man. The enclosures meant much the same hardships as the modern expansion of machinery. Through this process not merely was

¹ "Utopia," p. 182.

common land taken from the laborer, thus destroying a lucrative by-industry, but along with this came new methods of culture under which more land could be utilized with fewer hands. What labor-saving machinery did in the eighteenth-century revolution, the new method of culture did in agriculture in the sixteenth century; it displaced labor, decreased wages, and increased profits in much the same way. The less important changes in the earlier age led to profits, causing a growth of capital that made those more violent changes possible. This period sees the shifting of the advantage from the labor class — from the side of the employed to the employer.¹ Nor was this loss of wages and by-industry the only one noted by More. He pointed out that the vast economic changes had brought about changes in prices to the disadvantage of the laborer. Rents had risen, prices of commodities, such as food-stuffs, had also advanced since sheep-culture had cut down the quantities of farm produce.

¹ There were at this time many evictions in process. The rights of landlords to evict were disputed. The evictions went on. Fitzherbert, in "Boke of Surveying," says: "It was a time when all the land enclosures and pastures lay open and unenclosed. And then was their tenements much better chepe than may be now; for the most part the lords have enclosed a great part of their waste grounds and straitened their tenants in their commons therein." Noted by Scrutton, "Enclosures," p. 79; cf. Starkey, "Dialogues"; Ashley, "Economic History," Vol. II, p. 274; Roscher, "Geschichte der National Oekonomik in Deutschland," p. 123.

Monopoly had also played its part in forcing up the price of wool; this tended to discourage manufacture and resulted in higher prices to consumers. Because of this there was a breakdown of the household industry in England. "Yea, besides this the price of wool is so risen that poor folks that were wont to work it and make cloth thereof, be now able to buy none at all and by this means they be forced to forsake work and betake themselves to idleness."¹ In the light of the modern movements against the gigantic trusts, those products of that slow evolution since the days of More, these protests against monopolies and excessive profits are of great interest. More was champion of the laborer and the small holder against the spirit of monopoly.

In this connection More attacks what he considers as social dangers arising from the monopolist and the profit-taking class. Speaking of the growing custom of buying and selling cattle for gain, he says, "Thus the unreasonable coveteousness of a few hath turned that thing to the utter undoing of your island in which the chief felicity of your island doth consist."²

After having thus at length set forth the evils resulting from enclosures, that were working the undoing of old English society, More advises the interference of

¹ "Utopia," p. 182.

² *Ibid.*, p. 183.

the government to avert coming disaster, saying, "Cast out these pernicious abominations; make a law that they which pluck down farms and towns of husbandry shall reëdify them or else yield or up-render the possession of them to such as will go to the cost of building them anew."

At the same time a similar movement was on foot on the Continent against the industrial changes producing like unfortunate results there. Among the "Twelve articles of the Peasants" occurs the following: "In the tenth place we are aggrieved by the appropriation by individuals of meadows and fields which at one time belonged to the community. These we will take again in our own hands. It may, however, happen that the land was rightfully purchased. When, however, the land has been unfortunately purchased in this way, some brotherly arrangement should be made according to circumstances."¹ This conservative though firm protest was made against the same evil appearing in Germany in 1525. There was an uprising against the oppression growing out of the great economic changes which were beginning everywhere to show themselves. Against these economic movements writers of the time thought to oppose the force of legislation. With what

¹ Pennsylvania, "Translations and Reprints," Vol. II, p. 23; see also, Berens, "The Digger Movement," etc., where the "Twelve Articles" are found.

success the development of enclosures in England too well shows.¹

4. As has been pointed out the age of More saw the growth of a new economic force — the growth of monopolies. To the danger of this new feature he was not blind. He approached monopolies, their evils and abuses, from the laborers' standpoint. The interests of the latter were put in jeopardy through the operation of forestallers, monopolists, and those who strive for large pecuniary gains. He said: "Suffer not these rich men to buy up all, to engross and forestall and with their monopoly to keep the market alone as it please them. Let not so many be brought to idleness. . . . Let cloth-making be renewed that there may be honest labors for this idle sort to pass their time in profitably, which hitherto either poverty has caused to be thieves or else now be either vagabonds or idle serving-men and shortly will be thieves."² This type of monopoly included what may be called the commercial capitalist.

Equally pernicious was the land-holding monopoly. He held this landlord-class as idlers, contributing nothing, but living like parasites from the social income.

¹ On Enclosures, see Fitzherbert, "Boke of Surveying," 1567; Edward Lord Herbert, "Life and Reign of Henry VIII"; Lord Bacon, "History of Henry VII."

² "Utopia," p. 188.

Later he would have said they lived from the "unearned increment." A history of the changes in language would account for many so-called social changes. He calls these idle members "dorrers." "They are an idle class who live from the labor of those who toil." Karl Marx would have said they live from the "surplus-value" taken from the laborer. He adds: "First there is a great number of gentlemen which cannot be content to live idle themselves like dorrers, of that which others have labored — their tenants I mean; whom they poll and shave to the quick by raising their rents."

With bitter sarcasm he attacks those idle gentlemen who support and keep a great class of "retainers and loitering serving-men." He sees the problem of the non-productive laborer with the clearness of Adam Smith; he condemns this class with the severity of Karl Marx. Out of this class of retainers he claimed the number of vagrants was supplied. They never learn any trade and hence are of no social service. As a result, there arises a large class who are ill-fed, poorly clad, idle, and tradeless, given to a wandering life, a menace to society, and a danger to the state; a class rapidly increasing in the England of More's time and not unlike the modern class of "tramps."

5. Directly in connection with the discussion of the social disorders arising from these industrial changes is found More's scathing denunciation of the manner of

dealing with the criminal classes. As is the case with most socialists, More viewed crime as a result of poverty and the criminal a direct product of unhealthy social conditions. "There in the mean season they that be thus destitute of service either starve for hunger or turn manfully thieves; for what would you have them to do?" The humanism of More comes out nowhere clearer than in his treatment of the subject of crime. In his ideas upon this subject of such vital importance he was three centuries ahead of his time.

It is hardly necessary here to recount those facts, so well known, dealing with the condition of criminal law then in vogue in England. The simplest offences received the extreme penalty, and the law of procedure was such as to permit conviction upon the most specious evidence. It is probably true that with the full discussion of the growth of civil law in England the vast importance of the changes in criminal law and procedure have been overlooked. At the threshold of this reform, which began with those statutes and customs providing for capital punishment for over two hundred offences, and ran throughout the whole range of criminal procedure—at the threshold of this reform stands Sir Thomas More.

He protested, as has been said, against the infliction of the capital penalty because he denied responsibility to those to whom social conditions left no choice. He

also opposed it upon the more practical grounds that it was insufficient to prevent crimes. "Neither is there any punishment so horrible which can keep them from stealing which have none other craft whereby to get their living. For great and horrible punishment be appointed for thieves; whereas much rather provision should have been made, that there were some means whereby they might get their living. So that no man might be driven to the extreme necessity — first to steal and then to die."

This contains the kernel of all the later socialist protests against severe punishment and is a short but clear statement of the irresponsibility of the criminal. More treated the criminal as a product of unfortunate social environment, a theory made so much of and discussed in a later chapter. He considered that cruel and indiscriminate punishment as practised in England was not only morally wrong, but was useless and could not check crime, so long as the cause of crime lay so largely in maladjustment. The foremost task was social reconstruction and for this More makes provision in "Utopia."

Examination of the conditions in England at this time shows that the most frequent crimes were those against property; those against the person were relatively rare. Theft was the offence for which most convictions stood. It is further true that the laborers were

those, who, through existing conditions, were most often compelled to steal. Frequently out of work and driven from the stabler condition of manorial life, they took up thieving as a vocation. Against this class, then, laws severe and unrelenting were executed. More advances radical reforms for this unfortunate class.

This brings up one of the most rational and best supported claims of communism—the claim that crimes against property lead to the worst and most numerous infractions of social order; and that, with private property abandoned, these disturbances would disappear. To this general theory More committed himself most clearly. For him private property had no sacredness and hence cruel punishment for theft was immoral. “Surely, My Lords, I think it is not right nor justice that the loss of money should cause the loss of a man’s life; for mine opinion is that all the goods in the world are not able to countervail man’s life.”¹

More denies to government the right to take life. This idea was later taken up and defended upon the theory of the social contract. As an illustration Joseph de Maistre has shown that as governments are empowered by the members of society, each surrendering certain rights, it is insupportable that the members of society ever gave up their right to life,—a proposition which the theory of capital punishment in-

¹ “Utopia,” p. 189.



volves.¹ However specious such an argument may seem, it shows what interesting purposes the contract theory served. While More did not state the case so clearly, he questioned both the morality and the utility of capital punishment.

6. More passes from a discussion of the individual aspects of crime and poverty to a consideration of war and peace and national defence. Generally speaking, socialists have opposed the army and navy. It has been customary to condemn them as an enemy of labor, a burden to the poorer classes, and the stronghold and defender of the aristocracy. Strange to say, More, though a monarchist, takes the same view. Though he says: "Soldiers may be made out of thieves and standing armies may make room for idle labor as is seen in France," yet he criticises the army as a menace to peace, as a useless maintenance of idle men by the laboring population, and as generally useless and ineffective. He condemns war as a social loss and the army as an idle, luxurious class upon the shoulders of the frugal laborers. Drawing from the conditions in "Utopia," the example of the king abandoning war for internal improvements, he suggests the need of the nations limiting the expenditure for armament.²

¹ See Baudrillart, "Publicistes modernes," Paris, 1863, Ch. 3, for a discussion of the theory of De Maistre.

² "Utopia," pp. 215-216.

7. More finally reaches the radical and distinctive part of his social criticism — that touching private property. The safety of the commonwealth must not be despaired of. There is yet a solution for the social and political problems. The remedy is to be found in the displacement of private by public property. “Howbeit, Master More (to speak truly as my mind giveth me), where possessions be private, where money beareth all the stroke; it is hard and almost impossible that there the weal-public be justly governed and prosperously flourish; that justice is there executed where all things come into the hands of evil men; or that prosperity there flourishes where all is divided among the few; which few do not lead their lives very wealthily, while the rest live miserably, wretchedly, and beggarly.”¹ There remains little doubt that More has the England of his day in mind. That he believed that many of the evils of his day were augmented by private property seems equally certain. The relation of his opposition to enclosures and his general theory of communism seem also very close. Conditions of social equality he believed could be realized alone through equality of property which in turn demanded a system of communism. The system of private property produced only monopoly and the inequality and oppression attendant upon it. So the general remedy set forth by

¹ “Utopia,” p. 221.

More was equality of goods attainable alone through a vast enlargement of social control.¹

PART II

1. The description of the Island of Utopia contains, in the transparent guise of fiction, the political and social theories of Thomas More. After the first part of destructive criticism follows the constructive part outlining those conditions under which he believed a peaceful, progressive, and prosperous society could exist. The suggestions are not numerous nor does his plan seem workable; they are, however, valuable as illustrating the most advanced social thought of his age and as being the serious observations of the greatest scholar of sixteenth-century England.

His social scheme has as its basis the establishment of public control over property and the consequent abandonment of many features found with this institution. It is this adoption of public control as a panacea for all social ills that connects More's thinking with early communism; while parts of his plan, made necessary by this course, are of vital interest to modern socialism.

2. As has been intimated the right of private property has been more or less important in different eras. According as it vitally affects the problems of home-life, the family, social and industrial organization, and

¹ "Utopia," p. 222.

social and political structure, will its presence be held as essential to social order, to progress, and to civilization.

It is a fact quite natural and obvious, though difficult of demonstration, that the right of private property has grown in sacredness and importance since the downfall of feudalism. One of the most striking characteristics of this period has been the growth of individualism; in fact this may be described as the line along which progress has moved. The progress of this spirit has been seen as the individual has gained possession of certain powers and privileges. He has gained rights to freedom of contract and also of a political nature. The most important phase of this development has been the remarkable expansion of the individual as an industrial or economic unit. Of the types of individualism of Luther in the realm of religion, of Bacon in philosophy, of Rousseau in politics — none is more important than that described by Adam Smith. Against none has developed a more persistent opposition. As has been remarked, socialism is a protest against the overdevelopment of individualism; communism is opposed to that particular aspect which has to do with private property.

To properly understand the theory of More, it is necessary to remember that property is only an historical category, and the term means something very different

at different times. The sacredness of property has been much greater at one time than at another; for the importance of any institution varies with the age and with the demands made upon it. Private property, no doubt, meant much less to the England of the sixteenth century than it means to culture in the nineteenth; by the drift of events the right of private property will be much less sacred and inviolable in the century to come.

The period of More was one of transition from mediæval conditions of property-holding to that of an age of extreme individualism. This change gradually took place in England, and property as an institution, defended by jurists and protected by law, grew constantly more sacred; and an economic system built upon the basis of private property came to make it the corner-stone of civilization. Not until individualism developed did private property assume its supreme importance; it then became the basis of modern social order.

Under such conditions private property rests upon a twofold justification,—the natural rights theory of the individualistic school and upon social utility. The age of More saw neither of these theories highly developed; as will be shown in a following chapter, both doctrines were advanced and defended by later writers. The modern times have seen the theory of natural rights in

property much shaken; and the property-right and the extent to which it shall be carried must now stand the social utility test. More made his attack on private property, when, not only to him but to others of his age, it was working the ruin of old English society and threatening the peace and order of the commonwealth. In other words, he condemns private property for its social disutility. A study of the treatment of property-holders in the reign of Henry VIII clearly teaches that did such an attitude exist to-day, it would seem most dangerous to conservative minds, and it would be rank heresy to the modern jurist. To Thomas More such was not the case, and his communism was a conservative rather than a radical measure.

3. There seems therefore nothing unusual in the theory of a society based upon common property. It is set forth in his description of Utopia in a matter-of-fact manner. . . . "Though they carry nothing with them yet they lack nothing in all their journey; for wherever they come they be at home."

The many outgrowths of this principle More clearly recognized. He appreciates that important economic motives spring from the property-right. He admits the system of common property would lack some of these motives. "Yet they take no care at all for the living and wealth of themselves, and all theirs, of their wives and children, their nephews and children's

children and all the succession that shall follow in their posterity.”¹ More does not seem to realize, however, that this meant an enormous loss of economic motive which is one of the most important assets of any society. He seemed to think there would be no diminished product. “And yet besides there is no less provision for them that were once laborers and be now weak and impotent, than for them that do labor and take pain.” “And though no man has anything yet every man is rich; for what can be more rich than to live joyful and merrily.”²

The chief advantage to arise from common property is a solution of a problem long discussed by social and political reformers — the reconciliation of public and private interests. How is a commonwealth to prosper? By being so organized that the general and particular interests will coincide. How can this be done? By abandoning private property and making the interests of the commonwealth conform to those of the individuals composing it; by absorbing the individual interests in the general welfare.

Of all the principles More sets forth, this is the most important and shows the breadth of his mind. “Here where nothing is private the common affairs be earnestly looked upon. For in other places they speak still of the commonwealth; but every man procureth his own

¹ “Utopia,” p. 368.

² *Ibid.*, p. 368.

private gain. For in other countries who knoweth that he shall starve for hunger unless he make several provision for himself, though the commonwealth itself flourish never so much in riches. And therefore he is compelled even of very necessity to have regard to himself rather than to the people; that is to say, others."¹ According to More, then, common property alone will secure a mutuality of interests, and hence make a real commonwealth. Common property must be the basis of a commonwealth.

4. There is one particular of very great importance in which More differs from writers of his class; *i.e.* his attitude toward the family. Plato, his classic prototype, advocated not merely communism of property, but defended communal relationships in family life. He abandoned the family as a unit of social organization, believing it unwise to thrust a minor unit between the individual and the state or the politically organized society. In this, as in other respects, More does not follow his great master. Though he advocates a system of industrial society based upon communism, he preserved the family as the basis of social organization. With most communist writers from Plato down to modern times, the family has been held as the complement of property and the fate of one determined that of the other. The family has been held as the bulwark

¹ "Utopia," p. 367.

of private property, and property the bond of family unity. They have, therefore, held that the abandonment of property meant the destruction of the family. To this extreme More did not go.

5. Within the limits of a communistic society More had some interesting plans for social organization. He treats, as writers from the time of Plato have done, of the division of labor. This he discusses from two view points. In his artificially constructed society direction is given the labor-supply through the means of education. "Besides husbandry which (as I have said) is common to them all, every one of them learneth one or other several science as his own proper craft." After an enumeration of the crafts, he continues: "But of these aforesaid crafts every man learneth one; and not only the men but also the women."¹

His attitude toward the subject differs from that of Plato. Plato insisted on the division of labor. His idea was, however, based upon a political necessity. For with Plato, the end of the state was justice; and as this consists in giving to each his due, and as this applied to industrial life, it therefore seemed necessary that there be an enforced division of occupation so that each will stay in his own sphere and not encroach on his neighbor. The realization of the ends of the state in justice was conditioned according to Plato largely

¹ "Utopia," pp. 247, 248.

upon economic relationships, a decidedly modern socialistic proposition. More, on the other hand, emphasized the industrial and not the political aspects.

Greater latitude is allowed by More. His ideal state does not so completely absorb the individual as does Plato's. There is a small area of individuality left undisturbed by the social dictator. In More's scheme each was supposed to follow one trade, and that generally the trade of his father. Under the guidance of the government, however, there might be more than one trade learned and practised. "Yea, and any person after he hath learned one craft be desirous to learn another he is likewise suffered and permitted. When he hath learned both, he occupieth whether he will unless the city hath more need of one than the other."¹

Thus, More does not treat the division of labor in the narrow and technical manner of Adam Smith. He was rather interested in the broader aspects. In the social scheme of Plato division of labor was to underlie social unity. It was largely to take the place of property as a basis for that unity. The interdependence of the social classes was to be maintained through division of labor, and social unity and harmony secured.² The Church Fathers also shared this theory, and to More it was one of the important phases of the problem.

¹ "Utopia," pp. 248, 249.

² Franck, "Communism jugé par l'histoire," p. 21.

More discussed division of labor as between men and women based upon the fitness of the different sexes. "But the women, as the weaker sort, be put to the easier crafts as to work at wool or flax." In the earlier, as in the later, culture women are occupied at the textile industries.

As to the best form of industrial organization More makes little mention. In the textile industry he seems to have known only the household type. Speaking of the influence of fashion on the market, he says: "As for the garments every family maketh its own." During the life of More the household method was breaking down in England, and the transition to the domestic system was marked by those hardships More thought should in some way be mitigated. The chief cause More assigned for the difficulties in the old system was the high price of raw materials. In his attitude toward this older system may be seen More's conservatism. His devotion to the older form of industrial organization, to the communal control of land, and to the monogamous family — all show his reactionary policy and free him from the charge of undue radicalism.

6. In his treatment of the length of the labor-day lies More's most distinctive socialistic feature, and this constitutes his clearest contribution to ideas of reform in favor of the laboring man. In this part of his discussion he seems most modern; indeed, his statements on this

question might have come from a labor-congress of yesterday. The general statements on this question have been passed along, and the arguments to sustain this position have scarcely been excelled. True, he did not discuss the surplus-value arising from the long labor-day, as did Marx; he does not clearly point out the exploitation of the laborer by the employer, as does the modern socialist; he has, however, suggested strongly these very things.

After discussing the unfortunate condition of labor because of long hours, More says: "For this is worse than the wretched and miserable condition of bondsmen; which is nevertheless nearly everywhere the life of workmen and artificers saving in Utopia. For they dividing the day and night into twenty-four hours, appoint and assign only six of those for work; three before noon upon which they go straight to dinner, when they have rested two hours upon that they go to supper."¹ With keen observation More saw that the excessive toil of the new industrial system, though still young, meant mental and physical injury to labor and called for reform. One could imagine he was reading the report of an English industrial commission during the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

More's reasons for shorter hours show his appreciation of the needs of labor, being only tardily recognized

¹ "Utopia," p. 249.

to-day. [The time gained by the laborer was to be devoted to study, to attendance on lectures, and to healthy recreation.] He insisted that the leisure time be devoted to useful exercises, else riot, idleness, and slothfulness would result in greater harm to the laborer. More advocated the short day that labor might be saved from debasing drudgery, and the laborer be given opportunity for culture and for self-improvement.

The vulnerable points in the contention for the short day are seen by More and to some extent defended. The most apparent and valid objection is that the short day would result in a lessening of the output. This has been an objection waged not alone against the short-day propaganda, but against the entire socialistic scheme. If the capitalistic system is the most productive form of industry, then any change in a socialistic direction must, in the nature of the case, lead to a scarcity of commodity.

There are in More's scheme three features to be noticed in this connection. There is provision made for compulsory and hence almost universal labor. No place for a leisure class is found in the plan presented. There were to be no idlers in his society, no drones in the hive, no non-productive labor. All able-bodied persons must engage in useful occupation. [The lessening of the product, therefore, resulting from shorter

days would be compensated by the industry of the idlers.

This is just what the modern advocates of the eight-hour day argue; the existing industries would absorb the idle labor and thus more fairly distribute the burdens. It is possible by more widely distributing the existing labor-force to lessen the toil for each by providing a place for all. Women, More would put to work. Visitors must labor if they stay longer than a day; "he hath no meat given him till he hath wrought out his forenoon's task; . . . In Utopia they utterly forsake and eschew idleness; thinking felicity after this life to be gotten and obtained by busy labors and good exercises." ¹

The second compensatory feature in More's scheme is the employment of women and of the great body of clericals. These, he believes, would serve society better if they engaged in labor. "Besides how great and how idle a company there is of priests and religious men as they call them; put thereto all rich men, especially all landed men, which generally be called gentlemen and noblemen; take unto this number their servants; join to them also all sturdy beggars cloaking their idle life under some disease or sickness;" ² put all these to labor, and no lack of product will be experienced. "The rest of the people being neither idle nor occupied with

¹ "Utopia," p. 355.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 250-252.

unprofitable exercise, it may be easily judged in how few hours how much good work may be done and dispatched towards those things that I have spoken of."¹ This is a clear statement of the productive possibility of a society where all uniformly toil. More answers theoretically this objection to the short day.

In this connection there very naturally arises the question of what constitutes productive effort. This leads to an examination of the theory of More as to the content of the term "wealth," which, after all, determines the definition of the term "productive labor." This is not clearly expressed by More, though his meaning is clear. Labor is to be called productive which increases material goods and hence material welfare. In certain phrases this is made quite evident. Those are classed as idle who are caring for the spiritual needs. The governors are not merely active in civil life, but they do add to the material wealth. He urges that the material goods answering primary needs are more easily produced. The "Utopia" teaches that the supply of the primary wants can be readily met with plenty for all.

The problem of plenty is met not by increasing output, but by reducing the wants. This is a simple formula and popular with socialists. It would certainly help to solve the problem of relative poverty

¹ "Utopia," p. 252.

which is, after all, the chief problem faced either by socialism, by social reform, or by philanthropy, emotional or philosophic.

More's idea of wealth is that of the mercantilists, — not money, but useful material goods answering primary wants. Wants based upon desire for distinction did not exist in Utopia. There was no pecuniary spirit. Value in use was the sole quality of goods. There were no fictitious or artificial values. There was no energy lost in the strife of competition. Wants thus simplified were supplied cheaply. In one sentence he describes not only the ideal world of his thought, but the unrealized dream of socialism: "Wherefore seeing they all be exercised in profitable occupations and that few artificers in the same craft be sufficient; this is the cause that plenty of all things be among them."¹

There is one other feature in More's teaching pertinent to this discussion, dealing with the deeper philosophy of the great humanist. A new set of motives are revealed by his study of his imaginative society. In the society he described, the myth of the "economic man" would not be valuable even for the ancients. The pecuniary motive so dominant in our age is almost lacking. The desire for distinction in the possession of property is played off against the desire for simplicity. The desire for material wealth does not move men. The Hun of motives comes into play; a new idea of pleasure becomes

¹ "Utopia," p. 255.

dominant. More teaches a theory prominent in England from Robert Owen to William Morris and Ruskin. In this respect he more nearly coincides with the idealism of Plato which is so far removed from one school of modern materialistic socialism. A quotation will show his thought: "They embrace chiefly the pleasures of mind for them they count the chiefest and most principal of all." "For why in the institution of the weal-public this end is only pretended and minded — that what time may possibly be spared from the necessary occupations and affairs of the commonwealth — all that the citizens should withdraw from the bodily service to the free liberty of the mind and the garnishing of the same; for here they suppose the felicity of the life to consist."¹ It will thus be seen his doctrine of pleasure is closely related to his proposed solution of the social problems.

7. This being true, a glance at his theory of pleasure and pain is probably justified. It has been already pointed out that, as a humanist, in sympathy with the New Learning, More had already repudiated many of the sterner and more austere notions characteristic of the clergy of his day. On the other hand, his moderation kept him from indulging in the excesses which had begun to show themselves in the life of the Renaissance.

On the theory of pleasure one writer says: "The

¹ "Utopia," p. 255.

author takes the side of Epicurus in this controversy, who considered happiness in itself and in its formal state and not according to its relation to external beings; and in this view he asserted the felicity of man consisted in pleasure."¹ That More was an Epicurean in his teaching, seems not so clear. He seems rather to be a follower of Plato in this regard. He does give rather a large place to pleasure as an end, but it is pleasure of a high order. "But now, Sir, they do not hold felicity to rest in all pleasure but only in that pleasure that is good and honest and that hereto as to perfect blessedness our nature is allured and drawn as by virtue, whereto only they that be of a contrary opinion do attribute felicity."² With bitter satire he refers to those who, with perverted tastes, follow pleasures at once costly and unsatisfying.

More has not given any very clear theory of consumption, but he has perhaps made as suggestive statements as any early writer. Pleasure is the end of life; but pleasure in the sense taught by Plato. Pleasure is to be sought by the individual, but only of a kind that will not harm the commonweal. Pleasures arising from unnatural desires, vanity, etc., are harmful to society and must be avoided. He rebukes with severity many of the cruel and wasteful practices of his time. Hunting for sport is not only cruel and uneconomical, it is an

¹ "Utopia," p. 283. (Notes by the editor, Dibdin.) ² *Ibid.*, p. 284.

unnatural sport. This, More says, the Utopians leave to the butchers.

8. More does not distinguish clearly between the forms of social and civil organization. This lack of differentiation shows his crudeness, and its later appearance marks the evolution of the scientific mind. This is not at all peculiar to More as such an instance as Locke's "Two Treatises of Government," written much later, clearly shows. He does, however, appreciate certain facts in the study of social structure made much of by the modern sociologists; as, when he points out that in Utopia the wife goes into the home of the husband.

Besides the unity growing out of division of labor, More looked to the family and family relationships to lend solidarity to the social group. "The wives be ministers to their husbands, the children to the parents, to be shot, the younger to their elders."¹

Into the management of the family was introduced a large element of state control. The family life was to be controlled, as in Sparta, that a strong offspring might come to the state. This had to do with the nature and number of children brought forth.² More

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

² "But to the intent the prescribed number of citizens should neither decrease nor increase beyond measure: it is ordained that no family . . . shall have fewer children of the age of fourteen or thereabouts than ten or more than sixteen." — *Ibid.*, p. 256.

saw, what too few social reformers have been either wise enough or bold enough to 'advocate, viz., that the social problem has chiefly to do with the increase of population, seen from these two view points. With statistics More did not deal; and statistical analysis had to wait for the treatises of Malthus and his associates.¹

The family, according to More, must not be left to the regulation of the contracting parties; such control must be enforced as will save society against hereditary degeneracy. He treats marriage as one of the most sacred and important relationships, which the state should regulate. That care should be taken in the propagation of the lower animal species, while that of the human species is left to chance, caprice, and blind sentiment, seems absurd. The law of natural selection must be supplemented or supplanted by statutory enactment. Progress must be a reasoned process, and the rational element must enter into sexual choice. This feature of his social scheme was advanced by Plato and has been incorporated into many later works.²

More clearly recognized the dangers of overpopulation. He thinks overpopulation possible within certain

¹ Cf. Stangeland, "Pre-Malthusian Doctrines of Population," N. Y., 1904, p. 95.

² Bacon, "New Atlantis"; Campanella, "City of the Sun," etc.; Soetbeer, "Die Stellung der Sozialisten zur Malthusschen Bevölkerungslehre," Berlin, 1886, is an interesting discussion of this problem.

population groups, which was really the contention of Malthus. He did see, however, what Malthus seems to have overlooked; *i.e.* the local nature of the problem. [More laid much emphasis on the possible relief through emigration.] He calls special attention to this aspect of the case, an idea likely suggested by the westward movements of population in that age of discovery. In the chapter on domestic relations he sets this forth as a remedy, and has no fear of a general congestion of population.

In this connection it may be interesting to glance at some of the main facts in the discussion. Nitti remarks: "Before Malthus the economic theorists had not studied the question of population at all or had assumed that the duty of the sovereigns and states consisted in procuring the increase of population by every means within their power."¹ The attitude here set forth really dates from Bacon, who in his essays clearly holds to the need of increasing the population.² The view is urged, however, when there had been for many reasons a great dispersion of population, especially after the new military methods introduced by Crécy and Agincourt.

Moreover, the mercantile theory, emphasizing as it did the need of national power and arousing the local

¹ Nitti, "Population and the Social System," London, 1894, p. 2.

² Bacon, "Essays," edition of 1806, p. 136.

pride and jealousy, favored all schemes by which the greatness of a nation could be augmented.¹ The theory, then, that demanded an increase of population, rested upon a consideration of national, rather than of individual, interests. Opposition to the growth of population appears as mercantilism declines and eighteenth-century individualism expresses itself in concrete social theories. Overpopulation is not therefore a socialist doctrine, and these writers from More down have been in favor of an increased population.²

9. In no part of his social criticism is More so drastic as in his attack on money, with which he associates luxury. In his treatment of the evils of money he clearly foreshadows the more modern socialism. His theory was in direct antagonism to the doctrines of mercantilism soon to dominate English economic thinking. His teachings on money are specially clear and sound. "In the meantime, gold and silver, whereof money is made, they do so use, as none of them do so esteem it than the very nature of the thing [deserved." The money metals he placed far below iron in the scale of values. His statement of the case is strikingly similar to that of Ricardo. "Whereas gold and

¹ Frederick le Grand, "Œuvres," Vol. IV, p. 4-6. Finangieri, "La Scienza della Legislazione de Cittadino," Genoa, 1798; Vol. I, p. 263 *et. seq.*; Nitti, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-10.

² Cf. Stangeland, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

silver nature has given no use that we may not lack, if that the folly of men had not set it in higher estimation for its rareness sake. But of the contrary part, nature as a kind and tender Mother hath placed the best and necessary things open abroad as air, water and the earth itself; and hath removed and hid from us vain and unprofitable things.”¹

His attack on the precious metals is very severe. Gold in Utopia is used for vile purposes. Men make gyves of it for slaves, and criminals wear gold rings for punishment. Gold ornaments are a mark of childhood, and when grown, they cast them away as they would dolls and puppets. In most instructive comparison to the craze for the precious metals stands this telling satire against the exaggerated idea of the value of gold and silver and a plea for consideration for goods of primary value.

The evils arising from the presence of money More sets forth at the close of his work. Much of the occasion for theft, envy, and ambition is banished with money. “When money dieth, much of the cause of crime is vanished.” Money leads to speculation; men buy and keep grain for pecuniary purposes while the people hunger. “This same worthy princess, Lady Money,” he calls the one who so effectually shuts the way between us and our living. “She (pride growing out of money)

¹ “Utopia,” p. 274.

measureth not wealth and prosperity by her own commodities, but by the misery and incommunities of others." ¹

10. But one point remains in the theories of More. In common with most social teachers he deals with the city-state as the most perfect form of organization. This was natural, for as a student of Plato he had the Greek city-state before his mind. The city republic of Plato, the ideal city of Saint Augustine, the city of Machiavelli, and the City of the Sun of Campanella — all show how popular this concept has been.

There are certain characteristic features of the city fitted to the scheme of More. The city-state makes necessary a narrow control over the details of every day life, too familiar to need mention. The very conditions of municipal life lead naturally toward extensive social control which is, as has been contended, the chief feature of socialism. This is true as exemplified in the Greek cities; it is also illustrated in the modern tendency toward municipal socialism. The city presents the conventional in life typified in Utopia by a condition of extreme physical order in construction of streets, houses, etc., which was but a counterpart of that mechanical accuracy with which social life was supposed to operate. The control, therefore, in Utopia was marked by that precision, that unbending consistency and con-

¹ "Utopia," p. 371.

formity, so common in socialistic and communistic schemes. In this attempt to escape industrial anarchy they reach despotism, and in the struggle for equality and conformity crush all spontaneity and eliminate liberty. Thus, there is an attempt by More to reach equality. He makes no pretensions at liberty.

Like all humanists, More was an advocate of absolute monarchy. He was a worshipper of the "Prince." His pattern was the absolute monarchs of the Tudor House, and he does not depart from the type. He placed a strong personal ruler at the head of his system as most writers from Machiavelli to the Revolution have done. There was in this perfect social system the notion of absolutism; it had only a slight democratic element in it. He advocated what was later the conservative idea that the king should be chosen by the people. More differs, however, in this important particular from Machiavelli; his prince exists and rules for the people; as much can hardly be said for the "Prince" of the great Italian.

II. The socialism of More, then, if it is to be so called, is to be understood in its broadest sense. It means a struggle by the social classes for admission to the enjoyment of all the benefits offered, as society makes progress along various lines. It involves that view of society which sees in the laboring man more than a "hand." It considers that all members of

society, whether toiling with brain, or soul, or hand are endowed with high capacities and possessed of the right to enter into the heritage of a larger, richer civilization. More conceives of the man who labors as a being with brain and mind as well as with brawn and muscle, and plans to develop these higher powers.

As one of the most brilliant and influential representatives of humanism and of the new culture, More saw the need of a vertical as well as of a horizontal movement of the New Learning. Kept for centuries in those upper zones where wealth and nobility move, it could never work out the high ideals entertained by Thomas More, until the nineteenth-century Renaissance gave it that vertical tendency toward the lower areas of life. More must be viewed as forecasting that modern socialist propaganda, in which labor asks opportunity in this larger culture with its varied expressions in education, literature, politics, and art.

Slowly have the lower classes, following the aspirations of More, made progress in these lines. At first labor demanded the right to "subsistence"; this was met with miserable degrading laws. It next demanded the right to earn its subsistence, summed up in the phrase "the right to labor." Later it comes to stipulate those conditions under which this labor shall be done.

Gradually the laborer comes to participate in the higher powers, duties, and privileges of active citizenship and assumes new civic relationships. To-day socialism in its best expression demands a still larger enjoyment by the lower classes of the benefits of general culture.

CHAPTER IV

LIFE AND TIMES OF CAMPANELLA

I. With the study of Campanella the field is changed from north to south, from England to Italy, from Germanic to Romance culture. The appearance of social discontent and anti-social theories seems perfectly natural among southern peoples, and especially in Italy where the Revival of Learning started theorizing on other lines, and where the capitalistic régime showed itself quite early.¹ There certainly existed conditions favorable to social upheaval, and the Italian character seemed fitted thereto. There appears, however, very slight agitation and very little literature bearing on social questions in Romance lands. The northern countries stimulated at once by the two great movements, the Renaissance and the Reformation, had witnessed uprisings and had produced some literature and social theories more or less revolutionary. Italy, during this time, seems not to have taken much part in this sentiment of social disorder.

For a long time a calm had marked the social life of Italy. Away back in the latter part of the thirteenth

¹ Janssen, "History of German People at the Close of the Middle Ages," St. Louis, 1900, Vol. II, Ch. I. Cf. Labriola, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

century one bold character had dared to revolt against the petty but effective despotism of one of the republics.¹ Arnold of Brescia for some time scattered the seeds of social discontent in Milan, where was reaped the usual harvest of disorder and riot. As is usual, Arnold was led to attack property by a scandalous abuse of its power by one class and he developed rather a complete scheme of communism. Aroused by the power or abuse of power in the hands of the church, he bitterly attacked the landed clergy, as was done so much later in France and England. The disaffection spread, and war was waged not only against property but also against its kindred institutions. This movement was soon checked, however, and little came of the agitation for a cause for which its leader gave up his life.

There is, moreover, a general paucity of literature for a century following Thomas More, for which several explanations are offered. One of importance is the fact that so disastrous had been the attempts at social reform in northern Europe that the cause seemed hopeless, and radical agitators were stamped as enemies of state, church, and of civilization itself.² This conclusion seemed justified by the history of Lollardy,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

² Kirchenheim, "L'Eternelle Utopia," Paris, 1897, p. 83. Cf. Berens, "The Digger Movement," etc., p. 11; also Kautsky, "Communism," pp. 29 *et seq.*

the Hussite movement in Bohemia, and kindred uprisings. It is also true that great religious questions came to occupy people's minds, and abstract principles and even questions of scientific method came to the front, while the idealist and reformer were less patronized. With the opening of the seventeenth century the interest in social questions revived, and considerable literature was published. Of this the most interesting and important came from the pen of the Calabrian monk, Thomas Campanella.

2. Very little attention has been paid to Campanella by English students, and accounts in English of his life and work are very meagre and unsatisfactory. His works have, however, been quite fully treated by foreign critics. Owing to this paucity of English literature treating his life and works, a rather extended notice of authorities seems justifiable. Among the works from his pen those dealing with the social problem are: "City of the Sun," which probably first appeared in 1619, almost exactly a century after the "Utopia" by Thomas More; and his "Discourses touching the Spanish Monarchy," published about 1599. The date is somewhat in dispute, though it seems highly probable that it appeared shortly before the death of Elizabeth in England. The "Realistic Philosophy," Part IV, was probably written while the author was in prison and published at an uncertain date afterward.

There is quite an extensive literature of a biographical and critical nature. So many-sided was his culture and so far-reaching were his teachings that the life of the learned monk called forth extensive criticism in various tongues. Among these may be cited the treatise by Andrea Calenda, "Thomas Campanella and his Social and Political Doctrines bearing upon Modern Socialism."¹ On the philosophy of Campanella the short work by Sante Felici, "The Philosophical and Religious Doctrines of Campanella," is very satisfactory.² On his biography the work of Baldacchini, "Vita e filosofia di Tommaso Campanella," should be consulted. Luigi Amabile of Naples has written a very extensive treatise of his life, but it is cumbrous and tedious.³ Shorter notices appear in such works as those of Adolphe Franck⁴ and Von Mohl.⁵ The place of Campanella has been discussed by Paul Lafargue;⁶ and very briefly by Kleinwächter.⁷

3. It is perhaps a result of a chauvinistic spirit that

¹ Calenda, "Fra Tommaso Campanella e la sua Dottrina Sociale e Politica di Fronte al Socialismo Moderno," 1895.

² "Le Dottrine Filosofico-religiose di Tommaso Campanella, con particolare riguardo alla filosofia della rinascenza Italiana."

³ "Fra Tommaso Campanella la sua congiura i suoi processi e la sua pazzia," etc., Naples, 1882.

⁴ "Réformateurs et publicistes de l'Europe," 1881.

⁵ *Op. cit.*

⁶ "Die Vorläufer des neueren Socialismus," pp. 469-506.

⁷ "Die Staatsromane," Wien, 1891.

each nation sees in its writers and critics the forerunners of great movements and the originators of wise social schemes. Such a case is seen when Guizot states with an interesting air of assurance that every great idea has either originated in France or passed through the French to the world. A certain element of this spirit probably inspires those writers who claim for Campanella a very large place in the history of the incipient stages of socialism. The claim seems, however, to have a very good justification in fact. Campanella, monk, philosopher, communist, and revolutionist, made a very substantial contribution to the early thought of socialism.¹ He is not important because of the quantity he wrote; his works are marked by commendable brevity. Analysis shows, however, that his social theories and economic views are far-reaching and suggestive.²

Campanella was born, according to the most reliable biographers, in 1568 in the little village of Stillo, in Calabria.³ Educated for orders, in the declining days

¹ Calenda, *op. cit.*, Preface.

² The value of the Italian critics concerning Campanella has been questioned by Croce. That modern socialists look upon Campanella as their "Homer" is, of course, an exaggeration. Lafargue also comes in for his share of the criticism. See Croce, "Matérialisme Historique et Économie Marxiste," Paris, 1901, pp. 270 *et seq.*

³ Calenda, *op. cit.*, p. 4; Colet, "Œuvres choisies," p. 2, Franck, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 151.

of scholasticism, he was early noted for his power as a philosopher, and it is in this sphere he is best known. It was during the period of struggle then in progress against the ancient Aristotelian philosophy that Campanella gained his reputation as a scholar and as a great philosophic controversialist.¹

It may be of interest to take a glance at the intellectual environment of the man. He was born at the close of the life of Bruno, far-famed for having anticipated the theories of Galileo, who also was advanced in life while Campanella was in childhood. Telesius, whose disciple and defender he became, died before Campanella reached manhood. Francis Bacon, who seemed not to have known him, was seven years his senior. Bodin wrote his six "Livres de la République" while the monk's character was in the making, and Grotius was a contemporary with this brilliant group of political and social philosophers. The work of the noted chemist and founder of the science of Medicine, Paracelsus, appeared shortly before the social theorizing of Campanella began. Of the place of Italy at this time it is only necessary to note that five of the greatest scholars of Europe are Italians — Cardanus, Telesius, Patritius, Bruno, and the Calabrian monk, Campanella.²

¹ Calenda, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

² Rixner, "Leben und Lehrmeinungen Berühmter Physiker," 1829; "Einleitung."

Campanella's first great inspiration was Telesius, in whose defence he made those speeches on which his fame rests and which enhanced the reputation of his client. It is said that while Antonia Marta consumed seven years writing a book against Telesius, Campanella occupied but seven months in destroying it. Campanella's works were highly theoretical. Many of the writings of a similar nature during this period partake of a more scientific spirit. Bodin has been classified in much the same school as Campanella and has even been called very idealistic and utopian. He saw, however, the difference between his method and that of Campanella and More, declaring that he was not dealing with an imaginary commonwealth, as Thomas More had done.¹ Campanella, then, may be called the most idealistic and utopian of this learned group; he is more positively a social reformer than the others. He had, however, sound judgment on social and political affairs corresponding somewhat to Harrington, the premises of both men being very sane.

A study of this many-sided man reveals a strange life — a virtual paradox. An orthodox Catholic and a devoted monk, he was a worshipper of the stars and

¹ "Republic," Bk. I, p. 3; cf. Sudre, "Histoire du Communisme"; Baudrillart, "Tableaux des Théories Politiques," etc., pp. 24 *et seq.*; Gierke, "Althusius," pp. 151, 152 (ed. 1880); Bluntschli, "Histoire du droit publique."

placed astrology above his religion. Himself violently persecuted, his theories make no provision for liberty, nor is he a friend of toleration. A forerunner of the rational method in physical science, he was superstitious in religion and fanciful in his social theories. Although he lived an isolated monk in the cloister or a martyr in the cell he advanced a form of social organization which most clearly abandons individualism. Apparently a free-thinker, he was yet a slave to the traditions and ceremonies of the past.

There are some very interesting points of contrast between More and Campanella. Both were determined for orders, but More returned to public life and the law, while Campanella took to the cloister. Both were devoted Catholics. More, however, espoused the New Learning and was a devoted follower of Aristotle; Campanella, also versed in classic lore, revolted against Greek philosophy and became its bitterest enemy and most feared opponent. More was a marked conservative and on the side of order; Campanella was a radical and a revolutionary and suffered for his course. Campanella suffered twenty-six years of martyrdom for his radicalism; More went to the scaffold for his conservatism. More favored an absolute monarchy with the people having a kind of king-making power; Campanella favored a republic, though, of course, of the Italian pattern. Campanella was an agitator, believed

he could upset the power of Spain, destroy the existing social order, and create a republic;¹ More was an advocate of the Tudor monarchy. More resembled Karl Marx; Campanella was an early Lassalle.² The only hope of More was a return to the earlier and simpler life he saw daily passing farther away; for Campanella the new seventeenth century, with its eventful opening, was to be the dawn of a new age of social regeneration.³

Campanella differs from More in this, that he adhered more persistently to national ideals; he was struggling for the independence of the Italian states, but with the larger purpose of their national unity; More was willing to return to a more decentralized form of social organization. Both were spurred on by a knowledge of the evil conditions of their times. The aspect, however, more apparent to Campanella was the political; that which impressed More was the economic or social.

This very decided difference in view point must be noted. More was led to his discussion by a study of the economic and social conditions. In these he saw contradictions and flagrant wrongs. Campanella, and, it

¹ Lafargue, "Le Devenir Social," Vol. I, p. 312.

² Gonner, "The Social Philosophy of Rodbertus," London, 1899, pp. 5 *et seq.*

³ Sigwart, "Kleine Schriften," Freiburg, 1889, Band I, p. 138.

may be added, the Jesuits and the English radicals, go out chiefly from the religious or the religious-political point of view. They are therefore more largely political than social or economic reformers.¹

As has been said the writings of Campanella bearing upon social questions were very limited in quantity. His purely philosophical works were far more extensive. As in the case of More the social and political environment gave force and direction to his literary works touching political and social matters. These consist, as is the case with most social reformers, of two widely differing kinds. His imaginative tendency was, as in the case of Plato, offset by his sound, practical judgment. In connection with his highly theoretical "City of the Sun" should be read the practical treatise, "A Discourse touching the Spanish Monarchy."²

These two works illustrate widely differing methods. The "Discourses" are historical in nature and of a practical turn; written, as were other Italian works, to give advice to a prince, they are similar to the "Laws" of Plato as compared with his "Republic." This work is marked by good sense and keen insight and shows power of practical observation. The "City of the Sun,"

¹ Campanella spent twenty-six years in prison, where much of his writing was done. He was treated far more considerately than other radicals as he stayed in the church. Bruno, an anti-Catholic sceptic, was burned at the stake in Rome, 1600.

² Calenda, *op. cit.*, pp. 16 *et seq.*

on the other hand, is idealistic, philosophic, and at times fantastic. The "Discourses" were a direct outgrowth of his study of the Spanish Monarchy and its relation to the Italian states which had come under its rule. The work was translated into English in 1654 at the request of Cromwell and became widely known. Its relation to Spain was very similar to the relation of "Utopia" to England. It was written primarily to lead to reform in the Monarchy, but like the "Utopia" it had a larger intent and contemplated the general political situation.

Only such reference will be here made to the "Discourses" as may shed light on the general theories of Campanella. The sub-title is of some interest, taken in connection with the views of the author. Translated, it reads, "Some Directions and Practices whereby the King of Spain may attain to Universal Monarchy." Bearing on the same point he has in the Preface set forth the historic movements tending in this direction. The tendency shown by Campanella to shake loose from the old manner of interpreting things in terms of theology is clearly shown in the Preface. "I shall, notwithstanding, in a brief and compendious way, give your Lordship an account what my judgment is concerning this subject and shall give in the causes of each several

¹ Citations are to the first English edition which was done from Latin in 1654, at the request of Cromwell.

point; in General first; not after a natural nor Theological but after a political way."

In his views and in his conscious efforts to use a certain analytic method, Campanella was in advance of his contemporaries. In his "Discourses" he first lays down certain general principles which monarchs should follow and then proceeds historically to test their validity by examining the nations which had followed them. To certain conscious lines of action he attributes national strength and perpetuity. He furthermore clearly distinguishes between primary and secondary causes operating in social life. Speaking of historical causes he says, "Fate is nothing else than the concurring of all the causes working by virtue of the first Cause." ¹

In his social doctrines, as set forth in the "Discourses," he clearly recognizes the effect of physical environment as a cause in social evolution.² Thus his theory of social interpretation follows, perhaps not so distinctly as the "Spirit of Laws," those lines of reasoning later followed by Montesquieu, to whom is generally attributed the introduction of this style of reasoning. In his "City of the Sun" Campanella attributes social

¹ Campanella, "A Discourse touching the Spanish Monarchy," etc., London, 1654, p. 1.

² *Ibid.*, Ch. XXVII. Here he discusses the influence of climate on fecundity and the increase of certain social and individual qualities.

changes to the stars and lays stress on the general cosmography as an aid to an understanding of the control of human affairs. In his "Discourses" he treats in a discriminating manner of the relations of geographical environment to social change.] As will be shown later this is a thoroughly socialistic view point. The highly theoretical nature of the "City of the Sun" is offset by the fact that Campanella had designed to found a republic in Calabria, the leading features of which were outlined in his "City of the Sun." There was, then, a very practical turn to the mind of the Calabrian monk, and when he touches political and social subjects he displays considerable capacity.

4. Only the briefest notice can be taken here of the place Campanella held in the development of that thought his century did so much to bring forth. This task belongs rather to the study of the philosopher than of the socialist, but a sketch of the man must be very incomplete that omits it entirely. [A clue to his work along lines of inductive science may be gained from his "Discourses." In the sphere of physical science he advised the rejection of the Aristotelian theories and methods and he attempted to demolish the ancient cosmography through the development of more accurate knowledge and the adoption of the inductive method.] To this end he advised the Spanish monarch to close the Greek schools which must of necessity

teach both the matter and the method of the Aristotelian school.

He furthermore advised him to found and foster the Arabic schools, because of the attention they paid to mathematics and geography.¹ On this he says: "Then let him get about him the ablest cosmographers that he can and assign them liberal advances; whose business it shall be to describe those various parts of the world wheresoever the Spaniards shall have set footing throughout the entire world; because that Ptolemy knew nothing of those countries at all. And let him by the industry of these mathematicians correct all the errors of the ancient geographers." Of the teachings of Aristotle he says, "Aristotle, though his teachings were impious, yet was he little of a hindrance to Alexander." In his references to the ancient school Campanella shows the same radical attitude seen in his social theories.

5. It is coming to be more clearly appreciated by students of social and economic science that it is necessary to study and to grasp the general philosophy of the world's great teachers. The method of Spencer in his synthetic philosophy shows how imperative is this demand. Underlying any special theory on social or economic life or process is to be sought the substratum

¹ Campanella, "A Discourse touching the Spanish Monarchy," etc. Ch. X.

of philosophy and the general world-view. Perhaps the German students have gone about this task most seriously and the term "*Weltanschauung*" has come to occupy a very prominent place in their vocabulary of social science.¹ Especially is this true with those periods when revolution is prevailing and when "natural rights" instead of historic or traditional privileges are emphasized; when the metaphysician, and not the historian or the dogmatist, has the field. Of socialism these statements are true in a very particular manner. Socialism is not only an economic, it is an ethical system as well, and pretends to reëstablish mankind on a new basis of right-thinking and right-dealing. It is necessary, then, to take frequent excursions into the realm of general philosophy and metaphysics to discover those lines of reasoning, knowledge of which makes clearer the movements in the progress of social thought.

Now in these early periods of the history of social thought, metaphysics and a very abstract philosophy bore about the same relation to social theory as do the natural sciences to-day.² Psychology, in its application to social and economic science, may be said to have displaced metaphysics and, dealing primarily with the

¹ Labriola, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

² "A long development of the inorganic and vital sciences was necessary before sociology or morals could attain their normal constitution." — Ingram, "A History of Political Economy," p. 11.

individual, may be called an outgrowth of that metaphysics which dealt with an extreme form of individualism which helped to produce the French Revolution. Present-day social science, on the other hand, tends to interpret phenomena in terms of material thought, geography, climate, and the like. Early social study was carried on in the light of metaphysical and idealistic modes of thinking; modern social investigation advances along lines drawn by the physical scientist and in the light of evolutionary thought. Applied in a spirit of reform or of revolution the one mode of thought produced an idealistic, utopian, impracticable type of socialism; while the other gave a realistic, practical, scientific type.

This metaphysical-theological mode of viewing society pretty largely prevailed till the opening of the nineteenth century and was at its height when Campanella wrote. Socialism during the nineteenth century yielded to the same all-conquering force of the scientific spirit and the socialism of Karl Marx was a natural result. What has been said may be summed up in the statement of Royce that a general philosophy is necessary to give unity to theories and facts and an explanation of life and of the world.¹

¹ All great social schemes have been a result of an attempt to apply a general philosophy to social life. The history of the social ideas and ideals of Aristotle and Plato is but their attempted application of

A glance, therefore, into the realm of philosophic thought in which Campanella moved may be useful in explaining his social scheme so largely metaphysical. As one of the most learned opponents of Aristotle, a forerunner of Bacon in the field of induction, a precursor of Montesquieu in his mode of social interpretation — and withal a most philosophic and mystical theorizer in social spheres, Campanella's career certainly justifies a general study.

In the first half of the seventeenth century the old system of philosophy was very seriously shaken. The Age of Discovery, the influences of the Reformation, and the liberation of the human mind following the Renaissance and other great movements, tended to destroy the old and usher in the new age. It was to the introduction of this new age that Campanella lent his efforts and directed his massive intellectual powers. It was as a disciple of Telesius, who had long opposed the earlier teachings, that Campanella first doubted and then denied the ancient dogma and helped to lead in the inductive age. Kozlowski says of him,¹ that he was the first philosopher who went over to the side of sense-

their philosophy to social problems. The Metaphysics of Campanella helps to explain his peculiar views. The social philosophy and schemes in revolutionary France rest finally upon the metaphysics of the eighteenth century. Cf. Royce, "Spirit of Modern Philosophy," Boston and N. Y., 1892, pp. 1-2.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

perception, and attempted to construct a philosophy and a science in which there would be a large element of exact reasoning based upon actual evidence. His great work was the first attempt at a general synthesis of the sciences, an attempted synthetic philosophy. In this "*Universalis philosophiæ sive metaphysicorum rerum intra propria dogmata partes IV,*" he pretends to treat the field of human knowledge. This work includes a variety of subjects among which is found his treatise on society as a part of the general philosophy.

As Campanella pretended to apply his positive method to the social sciences it may be well to note its chief features. To him the knowledge gained by sense-perception was the only real knowledge. Led to draw a sharp distinction between this real knowledge and common opinion, he came to look upon experience and induction as the only safe method of acquiring knowledge.¹

There is, however, a most marked inconsistency in the career of Campanella. His thinking presents a peculiar mixture of idealism and realism, of spiritualism and materialism. In his general philosophy both as to matter and method he was a decided sensualist, approaching the modern materialist.² In his social

¹ Wuttge, "*Erkenntnistheorie und Ethik des Tommaso Campanella,*" p. 33.

² Franck, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 162 *et seq.*

teachings he was highly deductive and metaphysical. Hence in his "City of the Sun" there appears the most peculiar cosmogony and throughout his social scheme there runs a mystifying symbolism. Plato did not so completely involve his social scheme in his philosophy as did his later imitator. Thus some of his theory seems totally unreasonable when divorced from his general metaphysical scheme. In this scheme all matter is animated by a soul. There is an internal soul which corresponds to the soul of man and an external soul immanent in the world. The trees, animals, and rocks are all animated by this external soul. In his scheme of social organization the sun figures as the chief ruler; he describes the "City of the Sun." "Hoh" is the sun, which symbolizes "power," or the greatest controlling force, and is endowed with the external soul. In his theory, existence was based upon feeling; therefore everything existing had feeling. Knowledge was an accumulation of experiences, and hence everything could have knowledge. Love is defined as a state of perfect harmony existing in the world. In his idea of a perfect social state there are these three controlling forces: power, knowledge, and love.

On these propositions rested Campanella's hope for social harmony. He conceived all existence as presenting this inner spiritual harmony and unity, and it is a result of an unnatural social arrangement that

society is at war. This is only a more mystical, metaphysical way of stating the doctrine of natural law and order, essential and natural, which theory underlay the optimism of the eighteenth century. On this same idea of an inner unity and hence a possible harmony was founded the hopeful social philosophy of the early French socialists and indeed of those far down into the last century. Campanella taught that there was a double trinity, — power, knowledge and love, as found in man, external nature, and God. It was in the heavenly bodies that he saw the most perfect expression of this external soul; he was therefore much occupied with astrology and believed social affairs were in some mysterious manner controlled by the stars.

6. As a result of Campanella's opposition to Aristotle, he was inclined to take up the theories of Plato and in a way became very sympathetic with the teachings set forth in the "Republic."¹ In many of the main features of his social doctrines he was a follower of Plato; while in regard to his principal contention, that is, that a communistic society would succeed, he directly opposed Aristotle. He denies that the property bond is the only basis for social unity, and that the acquisitive spirit is the only one which furnishes the motive to toil.

¹ Fornari, "Delle Teorie economiche nelle Provincie Napolitane dal secolo XIII al XVIII," 1882, p. 186.

No serious attempt has been made by the admirers of the Italian monk to dispute the place so long held by Bacon in the progress of human thought. It is of some interest, however, to note that while the great Englishman was working out his system, another noted scholar was engaged along similar lines in Italy; and that Campanella was, by an application of the new scientific method, making for himself a place comparable to that which Bacon was to occupy in English culture. As a critic says: "Et voilà où Campanella voit l'avenir de la philosophie et la régénération de toutes les sciences."¹

7. Certain works have already been cited as sources of the thought of Campanella. Reference is here made to an influence of considerable importance exerted on the minds of reformers by the Jesuits and their institutions in South America. These seem to have been partly the cause and partly the result of Campanella's views.

¹ Adolphe Franck, "Réformateurs et publicistes de l'Europe," Vol. II, p. 153.

The following works are on the philosophy of Campanella: Kozlowski, "Die Erkenntnislehre Campanellas," 1897; Sträter, "Briefe über Italienischen Philosophen"; "Zeitschrift der Gedanken," 1864-1865; Carriere, "Die philosophische Weltanschauung der Reformationszeit," 1847; Baudrillart, "Tableau des Théories Politique et des Idées Économiques au Seizième Siècle," 1853; Rixner und Siber, "Leben und Lehrmeinungen Berühmter Physiker am Ende des XVI und am Anfange des XVII Jahrhunderts," 1829.

Besides these, standard histories as Royce, Weber, Überweg, and the like may be consulted.

The attempt to bring these Jesuit communistic schemes into proper relationship to the prevalent social theories was induced by the title of the leading authority on this subject; "The history of Paraguay, containing amongst many, new, curious, and interesting particulars; a full and authentic account of the establishment formed there by the Jesuits, from among the savage nations, in the very centre of barbarism; establishments allowed to have realized the sublime ideas of Fénelon, Thomas More, and Plato; by Charlevoix, 1759."

Of all attempts to organize an artificial society and to conduct affairs after a definite plan, with a decided creed and consciously wrought-out purpose, the Jesuit colony of South America furnishes the most conspicuous example. It was the most extensive and successful attempt at establishing a society after the dreams of idealists and reformers. This was a heroic example of the application of close, minute social control to the affairs of a society based upon communism. "Loyola contemplated calling into existence an organization, novel in character and in scope, and that fact he sought to impress on the world by a title conspicuously expressive of superior pretensions."¹

Brief analysis will reveal close bonds of unity between the doctrines of Campanella and this Jesuit scheme of a

¹ Graham, "The Jesuits," p. 8.

regenerated social organization. Both were at war with the same despotic power — the Spanish Monarchy. Campanella was striving to drive Spain from Southern Italy; the Jesuits, exiled from most lands, had set on foot a most ambitious plan to colonize in the South and finally to drive and keep Spain out of South America while their priests attempted to take North America. Here was a gigantic project contemplating the conquest of territory from Canada to Paraguay. Attention, however, can only be called to the communistic state of Paraguay.¹

Specifically, then, wherein lies the similarity between the Jesuit schemes and the teachings of the Italian monk? In the first place, as has been said, both adhere to the idea of close control by the state of the form and process of organized society. Naturally, both advised the suppression of the individual with a weakening of the motive of selfishness and an enlargement of the power of the social will and of social motives. There is found with both the happy thought that labor can be made attractive and thus the need of an external motive be lessened or removed.²

¹ Rambaud, "Histoire Générale," Paris, 1895; Vol. V, pp. 698 *et seq.*

² "On the one hand, every conceivable guarantee is provided for crushing out any germs of independent impulse that could possibly allow momentary play to an individual member; to some

In their practice the Jesuits also followed the theory of Campanella. The actual organization of the Jesuit colonies in Paraguay suggests very strongly the plan laid down in the "City of the Sun." The establishments were built around central points, in which centres were grouped all the inhabitants as Campanella suggested. In the midst of all was the church. On the outlying lands were the houses constructed for industrial purposes, but not for residences. In these and other external features there was a striking resemblance between the two schemes of social organization.

Property relations in Paraguay were also similar to those set forth in the "City of the Sun."¹ The land that was in any community was the common property of the group; its entire control was in the government. In addition there was a portion set aside near the towns, which was in a special sense a commons, cultivated by the community jointly. This feature resembled the early English "commons."² The product of this common labor and land was stored in maga-

movement of dissent, however suppressed or strictly mental from another emanating from a superior."—Graham, "The Jesuits," p. 14.

¹ Gothein, "Der christlich-soziale Staat der Jesuiten in Paraguay," Schmoller's "Staats- u. Socialwissenschaftliche Forschungen," Vol. 4, No. 4, p. 5. Cf. also, Graham, "Vanished Acadia."

² Kobler, "Der christliche Communismus in den Reductionen von Paraguay," etc., Würzburg, 1877, p. 26.

zines and kept for common distribution. The land lying farther out was divided every so often among the families, according to the number of members in each. This land was not considered private property; could not be bought nor sold by the person cultivating it; and could be burdened in no manner in favor of the holder, nor to the injury of the community right therein. The same thing held true of the houses. Certain forms of personal property could, however, be acquired in the Jesuit colonies. This was one feature in their peculiar polity that furnished a motive to industry and frugality. Those who showed idleness were compelled to labor.¹ An interesting regulation reflecting feudal influence required all the population, men and women, to give one day per week to the cultivation of the commons and that without compensation.

8. It is needless here to emphasize the very great importance of the Jesuits in the field of education. It may, however, be of some interest to examine their policy in Paraguay as it ran parallel to the idea of Campanella. They made a twofold division of the youth. The larger class devoted their energies to industrial lines. These were placed in schools where trades were learned and practised. Those not directly determined for industrial life were given culture of a more general kind, being trained in the more ele-

¹ Kobler, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27.

mentary subjects, such as language and mathematics. As is done in all socialistic schemes, the Jesuits laid great stress on agriculture, training in this line being compulsory for all. The common fields referred to above were a kind of agricultural station where training was carried on.

As in the scheme of Campanella the Jesuits gave much attention to the industrial arts. This fact contributed much to the early success of the social experiments in South America.¹ Commerce and trade in Paraguay were all controlled by the public power, none being left in private hands.

In these colonies there appeared the same problems which all socialism must face. The abandonment of private property destroyed at once the basis of social unity and a chief motive to industry. In Paraguay this lack seems to have been supplied largely by religious enthusiasm.²

9. Campanella and the Jesuit reformers differed on the question of the family. In Paraguay the Jesuits made provision for the continuance of the family, though marriage was very closely controlled by the public power. Both were eager to suppress selfishness,

¹ Gothein, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

² "The spiritual attachment to their order, the strongest perhaps that ever influenced any body of people, is characteristic of the Jesuits and serves as a key to the genius of their policy." — Robertson, "History of Charles V," Philadelphia, 1883, Vol. II, p. 453.

ambition, and greed; these must be eliminated if society is to reach its highest purpose. The Jesuits favored the employment of free labor as opposed to slaves, while Campanella under conditions would allow slavery.

Certain features marking these colonies are in line with early social ideals. In the first place, they were founded in an isolated portion of the earth away from the traditions and established institutions, with none of the forms of ancient culture to disturb. Again, they were planted among a barbarian people; among a people about as near Rousseau's "man of nature" as could be hoped for. It is also true that the originators of this social scheme were fitted to bring such an experiment to success because of their zeal and devotion and of the definiteness of their plan, to which they consistently adhered. The religious enthusiasm and exaggerated pietism, so characteristic of communistic experiments, was also not lacking among the Jesuits. There has been a variety of attempts to solve the social problem through state or school and church. The communist colonies of the Jesuits in Paraguay were marked by the most serious effort to solve it by means of the church.

There is, however, a more important and interesting feature of the Jesuit teaching bearing upon the socialism of Campanella and indeed upon all social theory of

this type. It has been already pointed out that all forms of utopian socialism base the hope of a reconstructed society upon the possibility of abandoning the forms and traditions of the past, in order that a social state may be set up after a preconceived plan. It is therefore of importance to note that of the political thinkers of that age [the Jesuits were the first to recognize the changeable nature of the state.] It was well along in the new era before the theory was seriously questioned that the church and the state were one. The sacredness and stability attributed to the church had also been posited of the state. [The stability of monarchy had as its support the idea of the inviolability and perpetuity of the church.] It was largely due to Jesuit teaching that this dogma was abandoned. The church was left to enjoy protection from innovation, while the state and soon society itself were to be shaken to their foundations as they came to be viewed more and more as subject to the social will.¹

10. It is easier to say that the Jesuit socialistic experiment did much to mould the thought of Campanella than to measure the extent of that influence. The inference, however, seems safe that their plans formed one general social scheme. Certain it is that the order

¹ Gothein, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3. See also Gierke, "Althusius," Pt. 2, Ch. 1, p. 65.

was at that time attracting universal attention. Rulers and students were watching with interest and apprehension as the Jesuits carried on their experiment. That Campanella has voiced some of their views seems highly probable.¹

Back of the two books from the pen of the Italian, and inspiring his practical experiments, there was a large public purpose in which the Jesuits took part. He had advocated in his writings and had proposed a practical plan on a small scale of what they projected so large. [Both were thinking of an enlarged Catholic rule; a more extended papal control; a Catholic system, reformed, liberalized, and reconstructed.] He and the Jesuit teachers saw, what the modern churchmen are slow at grasping, that the church must meet the social needs if it is to maintain its place and power. They saw that the church must enter the field of social reform. The closing decades of the last century have witnessed much the same movement on the part of the church.

[That Campanella's teaching had its influence on the Jesuit system seems also true.] The two men most influential in Jesuit society were Italians, Cataldino and Maceta. They were, in all likelihood, known to Campanella; there was also, in all probability, a common knowledge of the principles they so vigorously

¹ Gothein, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

applied. On this Kirchenheim says: "Such was the Christian social state of the Jesuits in Paraguay, of which Campanella in the prison had written. It is evident that this state agreed not merely in general principles, but in its details with the scheme of Campanella." "The philosophic writers and these practical reformers attempted to build a state after a given mechanical form." ¹

11. One feature worthy of note was the cosmopolitan views of Campanella. A few general facts may help explain the breadth of his view. The first one of a very general nature was his philosophic habit of mind. Philosophy, dealing as it does with the world of the abstract, is apt to lose the particular in the general and the special in the universal. History furnishes many illustrations of this. One of the best examples was the condition in Germany during her "humiliation," while her great philosophers were "ruling the air." As a

¹ On this subject consult: Gierke, "Althusius"; Pierre François Xavier de Charlevoix, "Histoire du Paraguay," Paris, 1757, 2 vols.; Gothein, "Ignatius Loyola und die Gegenreformation," 1885; "Der christlich-soziale Staat der Jesuiten in Paraguay"; "Staats- und Socialwissenschaftliche Forschungen," Band 4, Heft 4; Handelsmann, "Geschichte von Brasilien," 1860; Gottheil, "Die Jesuiten Colonien Paraguay"; Bonifacio, "Les Jesuites et Pédagogie au XVI^{me} Siècle," 1894; Hughes, "Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits," 1892; E. Friedberg, "Die Mittelalterlichen Lehren über das Verhältniss von Staat und Kirche," 1874; Döllinger, "Kirche und Kirchen.," etc, 1861; Kirchenheim, "L'Éternelle Utopie," 1897, p. 133.

land she was disunited and humiliated. Her thinkers were too cosmopolitan to be national; they dealt too much with the abstract and the universal to care for the local and practical affairs. This state of things holds in Italy in the age of Campanella. While the nation, already divided, was thus solidifying into many warring kingdoms, to endure for three hundred years, her philosophers were busy with the most general and abstract reasoning.

Again, Campanella was, in a way, a man without a country, much as was the greatest cosmopolitan socialist, Karl Marx. He, too, was a kind of world-citizen. Moreover, Italy was the land in which had lingered the tradition of a world-empire.

As a devoted follower of the papal church and an active member of the clerical orders, Campanella was versed in the history of the universal church, and sympathized with her aspirations to hold universal empire. Since the downfall of the Roman Empire the papal power alone had given unity to Christendom, and in it was the hope and aspiration to universal rule. Campanella believed with Pascal, Grotius, and other seventeenth-century thinkers in the unity of the human race, and looked forward toward the time when all peoples should unite under one world-power. He looked for a more perfect social unity through the reestablishment of a liberalized Papal See and through the growth of a

Christian empire under the rule of the Spanish monarch as vicegerent of the Roman power.¹

At first, Campanella was devoted to the Spanish Monarchy and believed Spain would one day come to universal dominion. Like so many, he was slow to learn from the events of his day, and his belief in a world-power seemed very genuine. This was, of course, the direction thought took till the spirit² and practice of mercantilism broke up the movement toward world-unity. As a recent writer puts it: "The cosmopolitanism of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the dreams of the world-unity, have been replaced by a set of narrower ideas concerning customs, laws, literature, and art by a set of independent states, each striving to realize to its fullest its independent aptitudes and characteristics. Thus do the nations of Western

¹ It would be interesting to bring the ideas of Campanella into contrast with certain radical teaching in England of the Stuart Monarchy. One Dutch writer, Peter Cornelius, held that this and the old system of society should come to an end, and that Christendom should become a world-state under the rule of one magistracy. Gooch, "History of English Democratic Ideas of the Seventeenth Century," Cambridge, 1898, p. 209.

² One of his biographers says: "Noch vor seiner Rückkehr nach Stilo hatte er in dieser Richtung geschrieben; über die christliche Monarchie, über das Regiment der Kirche; das Ideal einer christlichen Weltmonarchie unter dem Pabst als Oberhaupt schwebte ihm vor; die spanische Macht sei berufen sie zu verwirklichen." — Sigwart, "Kleine Schriften," Vol. 1, p. 137.

Europe pass through a period marked by this narrow spirit of extreme nationalism till Adam Smith and the Physiocrats again teach the lessons of a broader world-view and sympathy.”¹

Socialists have been about equally divided as to the breadth of their sympathies. Race environment, training, and the conditions of the age have had much to do with the tendencies of social students in this regard. Illustrating those who were decidedly national in their sympathies may be named Cabet, Rodbertus, and Lassalle. Those of a greater breadth of mind were More, Campanella, Weitling, and Karl Marx. Rodbertus stands as the best representative of the former, and Marx of the latter class.²

12. Enough has been said already to indicate the general direction of the political thought of Campanella. Living as he did during the struggle over the great national problems, the consolidation of national groups and of absolute monarchies, he was naturally influenced by it. Along with his predecessors he idealized the “prince” and was devoted to a centralized form of government. Along with most reformers of this type he believed in a hierarchy of personal control. In this respect the early socialistic schemes differ from any

¹ Reinsch, “World Politics,” N. Y., 1900, pp. 5 *et seq.*

² On the recent tendency toward the international socialism in Italy, see Labriola, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20.

creed of anarchism. They always provide for social order. There is only a slight tendency toward democracy in the earlier social schemes; in fact, very little in the later ones.

One of Campanella's contemporaries presents a very interesting contrast touching political theory. The Italian advocates an absolute form of monarchy coupled with the destruction of private property, especially in land. Harrington, on the other hand, favored a limited monarchy and a careful preservation of private property in land.¹ Harrington made private ownership of land an absolute essential to the permanence of society and the protection of the individual. Campanella saw the permanence of social peace and the happiness of the individual possible only through the abandonment of property. With one the existence of property meant social and political equilibrium; to the other it was the prime disturbing element and a fruitful source of discord.² Harrington would create a hierarchy with property very closely controlled by government; Campanella created a hierarchy with no semblance of property.

¹ "Oceana," 1656.

² See Gooch, *op. cit.*, pp. 290 *et seq.*

CHAPTER V

THE SOCIALISM OF CAMPANELLA

1. Probably no body of men ever so completely controlled the economic aspects of society as did the Jesuits. The general propositions laid down touching the efforts of the Jesuit society at complete social control, find their best expression in the theories contained in "City of the Sun" of Thomas Campanella. His position in the church has already been suggested as leading him to his theory of a reconstructed society. This general theory had, indeed, been exemplified throughout the history of the papal church. For centuries the church had attempted in a most studied manner to control affairs, civil, social, and religious. Nowhere in history has a system flourished whose organization and orders so entirely ignored the natural laws of society, and so thoroughly managed the social process by the mandates of councils. Out of catholic culture might be expected socialistic theories and experiments; in the general conflict between the social or centralized control and the free play of the individual will, the former would naturally prevail. The extensive control of the papal church, carried over into the industrial sphere, would naturally destroy private initia-

tive and abolish individualistic methods of industry. Individualism in industry and its accompanying progress were products of the Reformation and flourished in those lands where papal power was most thoroughly shaken.

2. In connection with these more general teachings of Campanella there remain certain special features of his social scheme worthy of notice.

[Of his theory of labor it may be said that he opposed slavery and advocated an organization of society upon the basis of free labor. In his ideal society it was not the custom to keep slaves.¹ Slavery, idleness, and vice he places in causal relationship. Of the seventy thousand persons in the Naples of his day only ten or fifteen thousand were employed. On one hand, he saw masses of overburdened, overdriven laborers; on the other, the idle and vicious wealthy. The scheme of Campanella provides for a better distribution of social burdens. In true Marxian fashion he affirms that, were all required to labor, the labor-day would be shortened to four hours.² This condition he saw attainable only through the destruction of a profit-producing system; this change would compel all to labor and make possible the reduction of the labor-day to four hours.³ But in the "City of the Sun," while duty and work are distributed among all, it falls to each one to work only about four hours every day.

¹ "City of the Sun," p. 237.

² *Ibid.*, p. 238. ³ *Ibid.*

The chief feature of the problem, then, is the distribution of the social burden. This factor, the leading one in the socialistic propaganda, was clearly seen and discussed by Campanella. More had seen the same problem and had advised such a social reorganization as would reduce the labor-day to six hours. It will be remembered that this idea was proposed before the machine had come to give its name to the age, to transform industry, and by augmenting the power of labor, to make possible a shorter labor-day with a still larger product. With Karl Marx the machine figured very largely, and made possible the shortening of the labor-day or the same length of day with an increased product, giving rise to surplus-value. Campanella drew his conclusions from a study of society still in the handicraft stage.

3. A fundamental proposition underlies Campanella's theory of the short day. It is necessary that all should labor if the task for some be lightened. When all the members of society share in its toils and sacrifices, then will the laborer be freed from his long hours and his irksome toil. It is the fact that the social drones are carried by the laboring masses that explains the hardship of labor. In Marxian terms, when none live from surplus-value, then can the labor-day be shortened. With Campanella, as with most socialists, it is the control of private property that creates a leisure class, and

this leisure-class, thus controlling the product of industry, exploits labor and lives from surplus-value. Modern socialism has devised more refined means of meeting this problem; the method of Campanella was bold and crude.¹ He proposed to throw all the members of society back upon labor for their subsistence by destroying private property, by instituting a system of communism.

The foundation of the system of Campanella, then, was the crudest form of communism. In his ideal state all things were held in common, and dispensation was made by the magistrates.² His communism is, however, of a broad and rather noble type. It does not merely contemplate material wealth. It means the participation of all the members of the community in all the benefits of social progress, temporal, and spiritual. "Arts, honors, and pleasures are all in common and are held in such manner that no one can appropriate anything to himself."³

4. The leading causes of the existence and accumulation of private property are clearly given. At the basis lies the need of gain, that a legacy may be left to wife and child. The home, then, is the leading fact in the

¹ "All things are common with them." — "City of the Sun," p. 225.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 225-226.

³ "But with them the rich and poor make up one community; they are rich because they want nothing, poor because they possess nothing." — *Ibid.*, p. 238.

development of private property. Riches, dignity, and honor are of importance when there is a line of descent and the dignity of a family name to be maintained. The clergy, monks, prelates, etc., are less useful because of this inordinate love of wealth.¹

Campanella differs from Morelly and later writers in seeing a vital relationship between the family organization and private property. With him the home fosters the desire for acquisition and leads to the accumulation of property. This being his attitude to the problem, his theory of the family can be easily conceived. In the system devised by Campanella there was community of wives. He abandoned the monogamous family. The dwellers in his ideal city have all things in common, even the women. This custom they defend from the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, the writings of Clement, Socrates, Cato, and Plato. In brief but unmistakable terms the celibate monk advises the Platonic theory of community of wives; it is defended as scriptural, historical, and expeditious.

The union of the sexes, as treated by Campanella, must conserve the larger interests of the state in supplying society with a healthy, strong population. With

¹ "They say all private property is acquired and improved, for the reason that each one of us by himself has his own home and wife and children; from this self-love springs." — "City of the Sun," p. 225.

severe satire he says: "Indeed they laugh at us who exhibit a studious care for our breed of horses and dogs, but neglect the breeding of human beings."¹ In this, as in all parts of his scheme, Campanella has the social view point. The pleasure, pride, and dignity of the individual life must yield and be subordinated to the welfare of the commonwealth.² "For they say that children are bred for the preservation of the species and not for individual pleasure, as St. Thomas so often asserts. Therefore the breeding of children has reference to the commonwealth and not to individuals except in so far as they are constituents of the commonwealth."³

In no other respect does his artificial view of society make itself so apparent as in his regulation of the family in accordance with the above principle. The men and women were to have no choice as to each other's companionship. Emotion or natural affection plays no part in his scheme. Desire and impulse, he declares, are wrong principles by which the most important feature of social life is controlled. "And thus they distribute male and female breeders to the best natures according to philosophical rules."⁴ Where Plato had

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

² Cf. "A Discourse touching the Spanish Monarchy," English translation, 1654, p. 70.

³ "City of the Sun," p. 236.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

advised the use of the lot in mating, Campanella would have the matter adjusted by magistrates. In some instances regard was had for individual desire and choice, but in those cases alone where no harm could result to the state.

5. As a corollary to the foregoing proposition there was no room for a leisure class in the scheme of Campanella. As has been said, it was necessary that all should labor if the burden of the toiler be lightened. With one-fifth of the population of Naples employed and four-fifths idle, long days and heavy work were a grinding necessity; with all the population productively employed a reduced labor-day would follow. Provision was made for the indigent aged; they were public charges. There was to be no "sturdy vagabond" class, as these must engage in some industry. There was no chance for the growth of a beggar class, as labor was suited to the capacities of all.

Campanella saw the dangers arising from idleness in all three classes. The idle rich went to extremes in luxury and indulgence, and fell a prey to vice. The industrious were to spend their leisure in recreation, study, and self-improvement lest they degenerate. Efforts must be made to prevent the lame, blind, and unfortunate from becoming a public charge. Emphasis to-day is placed upon the dangers of the idle rich; Campanella called attention to the need of pre-

venting an idle poor class. "No physical defect renders a man incapable of service except the decrepitude of old age, and even the deformed are useful in consultation." ¹

His opposition to slavery, above referred to, rests largely upon this principle. Slavery, he says, corrupts the population and leads to idleness and degeneracy in the free population — an argument used against this institution when it was struggling for its life in its last stronghold.

Thus, the labor-theory of Campanella, though very imperfect, contains several modern notions concerning the length of the labor-day. He advocated a shorter day. He advised schemes for self-improvement for the leisure time. Slavery was opposed because it led to idle, vicious habits. No moral standards are laid down. The problems are not discussed as having distinct ethical import, social utility being the sole test applied. No reference is made to any rights inhering in the laborer or in the slave. The main consideration is that the state be not harmed, nor the social manners corrupted. The criteria applied to actions are public welfare and social expediency.

6. The question of the demand and supply of labor is but briefly discussed. Of the nature of wants, the extent of the market, and kindred questions he has said

¹ "City of the Sun," p. 239.

little. Enough is said to show that he believed that labor employed four hours daily would supply all the necessities, but few of the luxuries of life. This is in line with sound socialistic doctrine. Reduce all society to the grade of ordinary labor and the demand for luxuries would be much lessened.

Labor is not employed to supply foreign markets. His theory involves a self-sufficing industrial state,—a state producing all it needs and little more. Hence commerce was little fostered in the “City of the Sun.” Exchange, in so far as allowed, was a simple form of barter. Campanella was opposed to money and its use, and believed a system of natural economy with barter was preferable.

7. In speaking of the form of political organization advocated by Campanella, it is well to recall that he was a citizen of an Italian city, and that the structure most familiar to him was the Italian city-state. As in the earlier centuries the dramatic conditions in Italy had inspired Dante and furnished a theme to the great poet-philosopher Machiavelli, so in the seventeenth century conditions could well suggest the principles of government advanced by Campanella. Though an advocate of absolute social equality arising from common property he was devoted to absolutism in government.

¹ Rodbertus, “Overproduction and Crises.” Introduction by Professor Clark, London, 1898, pp. 16-17.

A feature of considerable interest was that within limitations the government was elective. The magistrates were elected, choice being limited to those whose training in the arts and sciences made them most competent to rule. The chief magistrates must be above thirty-five years of age. If eminently fitted, they held office for life. Citizenship was limited to men of over twenty years, who formed an assembly not unlike the Ecclesia of Clisthenes.

From what has been said, it will appear that the governing body in the state depended neither upon an aristocracy of wealth nor of birth. Some new principle, therefore, must serve as selective for the governing classes. This the author finds in the realm of science. Campanella wished to establish an aristocracy of education and put the control of society into their hands. The teachers of the arts and sciences, he urged, are best fitted to choose the rulers in the different departments. That higher education unfits men for practical duties and political services he denies, while at the same time he condemns the hereditary principle of selection. "We, indeed, are more certain that such a very learned man has the knowledge of governing than you who put ignorant persons in authority and consider them suitable merely because they have sprung from the rulers or have been chosen from a powerful faction."¹

¹ "City of the Sun," p. 229.

[Campanella has the utmost confidence in the trained mind in public life, and has no confidence in heredity as a selective principle.¹]

8. There has been perhaps no political principle more generally accepted nor more often acted upon than that of centralization of political power. Historical development has brought with it the suppression of local patriotism and local pride in view of a larger grouping. This principle has been recognized from the formation of the Delian Confederation down to the organization of the German Empire. In these instances, as in countless others, this spirit of particularism has been most destructive to perfect socialization and complete national unity. Advocates of a more liberal policy and of a larger social unity, from Miltiades down to Bismarck, have not hesitated to weaken or destroy this local spirit which was a foe to the centralizing process. Such friends of consolidation have, however, generally dealt with politically organized bodies such as small kingdoms, free cities, semi-sovereign states, and the like; few have had the hardihood to fall back of these and interfere with the socializing, or, as some say, the de-socializing force of the family-group.

The author of the "City of the Sun" did not overlook the fact that in the abandonment of private property, of family life, and the attendant desire for inheritance,

¹ Cf. The reasoning of Plato, "Republic," Bk. VI.

he had undermined the foundations of society and broken some of the strongest bonds of social unity. In meeting this situation he reveals some interesting social philosophy. He has a definite theory of social unity. Campanella was too wise to propose the destruction of the existing social forces without meeting the inevitable question as to the motives necessary to industrial endeavor; he was too thoughtful to banish the common centres in which social interests might gather and not consider the probability of finding a new basis of social equilibrium.

In his theory of social unity, Campanella partly follows Plato. When discussing the family and its place in the state, Plato condemns the family as an obstacle to the perfect devotion of the citizen to the state. Banish family life and the citizen has no cause for pride, no object of devotion, no stimulus to effort and sacrifice except the state. The state, as an institution, is then without a rival. More than once has this principle had historical confirmation. It was evidenced in the unconquerable spirit of Sparta in Plato's day. It was in the plan of Hildebrand when he enforced celibacy among the clergy of Germany; and to this general theory the Italian monk was no stranger. He had, indeed, given warning against the dissension and disunion that were weakening and threatening Italy and Spain. As a celibate monk he

was devoted to the Holy Church only. The recent history of Italy was not wanting in examples, as Guelph and Ghibelline struggled for mastery, and great families with their unbridled ambitions threatened, even destroyed, the unity, and threatened the very existence of the Italian state.

It is, then, not much wonder that Campanella, devoted to one supreme organization, should have opposed those forces tending to disunion, and among them considered the family as an enemy to close social unity. He condemns the family as the source of self-love. Dishonesty arises in the state, since to acquire property and honor for the family statesmen will be led to grasp at the property of the state and misuse public office. One would think he wrote of the twentieth instead of the seventeenth century, and of the United States instead of Naples. He sums up his thought as follows, "But when we take away self-love, there remains only love for the state."¹

A second feature in his theory recalls an interesting part of the argument of Aristotle. It will be remembered that in his "Ethics," Aristotle places great emphasis upon friendship as a principle of social unity and coöperation.² Campanella, while briefly discussing the

¹ "City of the Sun," p. 225.

² "Ethics," Ch. IX. Cf. Adam Smith, "Theory of Moral Sentiments," expressing the same views.

family, shows his sympathy with this theory. As has been stated, love based upon sex or filial devotion had no place in his system. There is, however, one type of affection which he considers a true social force. "Moreover that love born of eager desire is not known among them, only that born of friendship."¹

To the objection that with a society based on communism, mutual helpfulness, so often the basis of friendship and of social interdependence, would be lacking (people having neither the need nor the power to aid), Campanella wisely remarks that material interests are not the only ones in society, nor is their absence the destruction of friendship. "Friendship is recognized among them in war, in infirmity, and in the art contests whereby they aid one another."²

The theory of Campanella was, moreover, open to another objection: the one which in ancient times Aristotle used with such force against Plato. Aristotle had urged that with selfish personal motives removed, under a system of common property, industry would suffer, and what was everybody's business would be nobody's business.³ Campanella, in restating the position of Aristotle, expresses in a very modern form the chief objection to socialism: "Under such circumstances no one will be willing to labor when he expects

¹ "City of the Sun," p. 237.

² *Ibid.*, p. 226.

³ Aristotle, "Politics," Jowett's translation, Vol. I, p. 30.

to live from the labor of others.”¹ Admitting this difficulty, he believes that the consciousness of union with a larger social aggregate will supply motive, and that industry will not decline. “But I declare to you that they burn with so great a love for their fatherland as I could scarcely have believed possible.”² Campanella urged that a society based upon common property had equal chances of success with one founded on private property.

The subject, however, may be approached from a different view point. The strength of the motive to labor need only be proportionate to the onus of labor. In the system of Campanella labor is considered neither severe nor dishonorable. All labor is honorable, and hence no class-distinctions can arise from the nature of the employment. The society described is one where all are employed, and where idleness alone is condemned. “Wherefore no one thinks it lowering to wait on table or to work in the kitchen or fields.”³ Labor, in its ideal state, is a part of civic duty, and obloquy attaches to idleness as it does to the neglect of civic activity. “Those occupations that require the most labor, such as working in metals and building, are the most praiseworthy among them.”⁴ Here, then, is a new type of nobility, — a nobility based upon toil, an aristocracy of labor.

¹ “City of the Sun,” p. 225.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 225-226.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

9. This argument from Campanella rests upon that idea of labor which was so much enlarged on by the great French socialist, Fourier. Campanella hoped to so adapt employment to inclination and to capacity that labor would be freed of much of its pain and sacrifice. This was a part of his scheme for maintaining the efficiency of labor when the strong motive of individual gain had been removed.

This coördination of powers and occupation began in the schools where the youths were trained in those lines chosen because of fitness and inclination. Men of lesser intellect were kept in agricultural pursuits; those of peculiar powers were put at the arts and sciences. Those who at like age showed similar tastes and faculties were so classified industrially as to bring harmony to the state.¹ By this means, he hoped to avoid that anarchy in the industrial world due to a bad distribution of the supply of labor. [According to Campanella, there is possible such an adjustment of the labor-supply that none will avoid labor because it is either dishonorable or distasteful.] In this theory is expressed the hope of social unity, of individual satisfaction, and of industrial efficiency.

It will thus be seen that the theory of Campanella stands in marked contrast to the theory of selfishness or the theory based upon the concept of the "economic

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

man." The "economic man" was man viewed clearly from the individualistic standpoint; Campanella's concept of man is gained by seeing him in his social attitude — man a mere function of society. These characters are about equally mythical. A system of social philosophy built upon either idea is untrue to the facts. Man never has been, probably never will be, so egoistical as classical economics assumed. Man may never be so highly socialized as Campanella pictured him. Each theory has its lessons as to the possibilities of socialism. The theory of Campanella suggests many things concerning the possible limitations on human selfishness. His was a most attractive dream of a peaceful society, composed of very highly socialized members. The teaching of classical economics has its valuable warnings touching those obstacles to that happy state whose primary feature was an absence of selfishness.

10. The teachings of Campanella, thus briefly sketched, display a bold thinker, for his day and place, as well as a man of sound social and political judgment. For one writing from the cloister, he possesses clear insight into the facts of society and government. The romance, "City of the Sun," must be classed as one of the pioneer socialistic documents. What he has said is not great in quantity but is very rich in suggestiveness. He saw and appreciated certain principles

since laid hold of and worked into the system of modern socialism. In his teachings on the possibility of social reorganization he follows that type of interpretation which had been dominant for two thousand years. He combined in an interesting manner a knowledge of practical affairs with a subtle philosophic insight and a keen metaphysical sense.

II. As has been intimated, there exist some interesting points of comparison between the social teachings of the two philosophers, Campanella and Bacon. What Bacon had to say on social life was left in his short but interesting fragment, the "New Atlantis." In this, he gave the general outlines of a perfect social state.

Bacon was a statesman, philosopher, man of affairs, and a contemporary of the Italian monk. From the first, he was inclined toward politics and statecraft. He believed a life devoted to the creation of a perfect social state was the loftiest type of life. After devoting himself for a time to social study, he turned toward philosophy and abandoned his social schemes. The "New Atlantis" was written at the same time as the "City of the Sun," though it seems improbable that their illustrious authors ever met or were aware of each other's theories or social studies.

It has often been lamented that for various reasons certain great writers did not complete the works they had begun; as when William Archer Butler left un-

completed his history of philosophy, after writing two brilliant volumes; or when Henry Buckle laid aside his pen after writing his remarkable "Introduction to a History of Civilization in England," not having reached his main theme. The same regrets may be expressed that Bacon never finished, as he expected to do, a great political masterpiece. What he has left in "New Atlantis" shows what the nature of his thinking was, and illustrates the application of his philosophic thought to social science.¹

Bacon occupied much the same position in English thought as did Campanella in Italian. As the latter had opposed the method and teachings of Aristotle, so had Bacon stood out against the deductive, abstract reasoning of his time. In his social theory he advocated complete social reconstruction. He treated society as a structure and not as an organism; a thing to be controlled by social and not by natural law. He also exaggerated the influence of the social will, consciously ordering social progress. It was therefore natural that he should place a large importance upon knowledge. He advocated the creation of a social condition where the control should be in the hands of philosophers.

12. The opening of the "New Atlantis" recalls the

¹ It was the intention to treat fully the movement in England during the Commonwealth. The main character has been ably discussed by L. H. Berens in the "Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth," London, 1906.

features marking other works of its kind. Under the influence of an age of discovery, Bacon pictures a company driven to an unknown land. There the usual fear of the natives terrorizes them — a fear born of the knowledge of the habits of civilization. The usual detail is indulged in describing the material aspects of this *terra incognita*. The same happy disillusionment occurs upon finding the barbarian life so mild and their manners so peaceable. “New Atlantis” is a city where ideal conditions exist. Nature, as pictured there, is most prodigal in her care for the physical comfort of the happy citizens. The formation is fitted to every need, the material conveniences standing in marked contrast to the London of Bacon’s day, or even the modern city.

According to Bacon, the end of government is the welfare of the people. The king of the ideal state must rule by virtue of his ability and his inclination to rule for the commonwealth. The state should be, to a large extent, self-sufficient. Foreign influence must be carefully guarded lest the oft-recorded invasions of vice, luxury, and evil manners should here corrupt the population. In his discussion of the marriage relation, Bacon indulges in a bitter satire on the social morals of his age. He intimates that in the society of his day marriage was but a cloak for immorality; and that the family was only a corrupt bargain, “wherein is sought

alliance or position or reputation with some desire (almost indifferent) of issue.”¹ As in the “City of the Sun,” the end sought through marriage is to supply a strong offspring to the state. Any union threatening social welfare is forbidden.

The “New Atlantis” presents the picture of a perfect social state viewed from a scientific standpoint. It is the philosophers’ state. It is the dream of a philosopher who believed that the highest purpose of the state was to secure intellectual equality. Bacon’s society was established, not upon a communism of wealth, but upon a communism of knowledge. He conceived of a cultural state, pure and simple. His highest concept of good was of the intellectual type. His communism meant the largest possible participation of all the members in the benefits of society. Society should be so reconstructed as to grant to all the blessings of general culture.

There is, moreover, a very decided materialistic color to the last part of his work. There is found there a very remarkable classification of those things which minister to the physical wants of man. The teaching of Bacon is more Epicurean than is that of Campanella. If the writings of Campanella are full of the doctrine of high thinking, Bacon’s theories have room for the praise of good living. His interesting fragment is

¹ “New Atlantis,” Morley edition, p. 198.

rich in practical wisdom; it abounds in suggestions touching almost every phase of useful science and progressive art. The great purpose, however, of all social effort of the "New Atlantis," Bacon sets forth in one sentence, showing the spirit and the high purpose of the writer. "But thus you see we maintain a trade, not for gold, silver, or jewels, not for silks nor for spices, nor for any commodity of matter, but only for God's first creature, light; to have light, I say, of the growth of all parts of the world." ¹

13. This thesis pretends to be an introduction to the study of socialism, which comments on certain writers who appear as its precursors and pioneers. What importance, then, has Campanella in these incipient stages? Of him a French critic says: "Campanella, Harrington, and Fénelon are the successors of Plato, of the 'Republic,' of Savonarola, and of Thomas More, and the forerunners of Rousseau, Mably, Fourier, and of Saint-Simon." ² Sigwart calls him the forerunner and founder of a system of socialistic thought.³ Kirchenheim calls him the founder of radical socialism, who saw

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

² Franck, "Réformateurs et publicistes, de l'Europe," Vol. II, pp. 150-151.

³ "Er ist derjenige der zuerst ein vollkommen socialistisches System wissenschaftlich begründet hat, an Geist und Consequenz den meisten seiner Nachfolger weit überlegen." — Sigwart, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

clearly the conflict between the individual and society.¹

The "City of the Sun" is one of the clearest expressions of a radical type of social reform and is logical in the extremes to which it goes.² It is the clearest and most rational scheme for a perfect social state thus far written.³ In the scheme of control suggested, Campanella has embodied most of the ideas of the hierarchy of Saint-Simon. Their schemes of organization are strikingly similar.

14. The social teachings of Campanella, then, may be briefly described in the first place as reactionary, a feature he had in common with Thomas More. He shows this attitude on various occasions. He had struggled to bring back the power of the Catholic clergy, as the Jesuits had done in the counter-reformation. The new and interesting feature of his plan was an attempt to bring the church up to the new demands and to fit it to meet the new economic conditions. This Campanella hoped to do by giving it a deeper social

¹ "Mais la pauvreté de l'individu doit avoir pour résultat la richesse de la collectivité, et c'est ainsi que Campanella a été défendu de nos jours par Fourier, Bebel, et d'autres, seulement aucun ne l'a surpassé en audace." — Kirchenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 99. Cf. Franck, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 7, where he calls Campanella the founder of the system of Saint-Simon.

² Sudre, "Histoire du Communisme," p. 198.

³ Lafargue, "Die Vorläufer des neueren Socialismus," p. 492.

and economic significance. His was not state — but like the Jesuits' scheme — it was church socialism.

These men saw a very important thing much emphasized to-day, the weight of economic causes; to some extent they appreciated the importance of the economic basis of society. They saw that attention must be paid to industrial and economic conditions, and that these form the foundations upon which a solid political structure must rest.¹

The communism of Campanella was not of a gross, material kind, so often and doubtless rightly condemned. It meant, as Schäffle remarks, more than a mere division of goods. It involved a general and equal participation of all in the products of culture and in the results of social progress. He taught that all should share alike in those social institutions, and that there should be social coöperation all along the line. Industries, he said, should be open to all, and this at a time when labor-castes ruled industrial society and narrow favoritism was dominant over Europe. All institutions were to be entered by those fitted for them by nature or by culture. (His was a most comprehensive type of communism, including the communism of women.) It was

¹ The same thing was true of the English writers of this time. "Alone of all his contemporaries, Harrington understood that the causes of the great upheaval which had been witnessed needed to be sought in the underlying social and economic transformation." — Gooch, *op. cit.*, p. 292. Cf. Kirchenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

directed toward breaking up the home with its exclusiveness, the classes with their privileges, and absolute government with its oppressiveness.

Campanella advocated certain sane ideas on social organization. Some of these are to-day in force; some await fulfilment, others were but dreams. [He advocated free and compulsory education for all classes.] He advised changes in the school curriculum that would bring more practical results. He laid special emphasis on the need of care in the propagation of offspring. Therefore he abandoned marriage as based upon sentiment and provided for the social control of the family, whereby fitness and not capricious fancy should be the basis of sexual union. The underlying principle of his social scheme was that society can never be a success till the social will completely dominates the individual will. Egoism is a mortal foe of social welfare and harmony, and hence those institutions that foster selfishness and egoism, such as property and the family, must be sacrificed to the welfare of the larger social group.

Attention has also been called to his theory of the devotion to a larger social aggregate. This had been a part of the theory of the Papal See since the time of Gregory the Great in the eleventh century. The same reasoning had led to the system of celibacy among the German monks, established in order to free them

from the limiting, narrowing influences of home life, and to keep them from entangling alliances, dangerous to Italian domination.¹ That Campanella drew much of his inspiration from this practice and tradition seems highly probable.

In the scheme of Campanella, then, the state invades the sphere of individual action and initiative in its minutest details. The importance of the individual arises from his attachment to the larger group; and he is most useful when he most completely conforms to the social will.

Campanella put forth few views that might be called economic. What he says is scattered throughout his works and is not of great interest. On the theory of distribution he has no clear ideas; indeed, with a system of communism, it would seem none is needed. As is the situation in connection with all similar schemes, however, the problem of distribution still perplexes. In fact, the further these writers depart from the natural laws governing in the economic world, the more difficult does the situation appear. Campa-

¹ On this reference may be made to the general works and to one work by Henry C. Lea. On this he says: "By the efforts of Gregory, the monk was, in theory at least, separated irrevocably from the world and committed to an existence which depended solely upon the church. Cut off from family and friends, the door closed behind him forever, and his only aspiration beyond his own wants could but be for his abbey and church," etc. — Henry C. Lea, "Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church," pp. 117-118.

nella taught that the individual should be rewarded by society according to his capacity, and the work done was the test of capacity. In the last analysis, however, the wants of each were determined by society, as none could live in luxury and none should be allowed to want. In this respect, his theory was very similar to that of the later French socialists.¹

It may be very reasonably asked what all this mysticism and metaphysical theory contains that is of interest to the social student? Has not Campanella, in his way, laid hold of a great fact in social thought and interpretation? He has set forth the fact, hailed as an acquisition of the nineteenth century, that social development is only one phase of the general cosmical process. Obscured by much confusing symbolism, this idea appears in the teachings of Campanella. Mingled with much metaphysical and theological obscurity it is; lacking almost entirely in any clear inductive analysis it may be; yet his work foreshadows an attempt at a synthetic treatment of scientific thought. Take as an illustration a quotation from a sonnet: "The universe is a great and perfect animal, statue of God and made in his image." "We are on the earth which is a grand animal on a greater one still as the vermin on our bodies."²

¹ Adolphe Franck, "Réformateurs," etc., Vol. II, p. 194.

² *Ibid.*, p. 165.

Campanella may be said to be the only philosopher in Italy to whom the liberation of the human mind in the sphere of religion and philosophy had an application to the conditions in society and the state. To some extent, at least, he attempted to apply the new thought to the social world. With him the Reformation issued in a more or less clear social scheme. As Thomas More had given a social direction to the new thought in England, so in Italy Campanella was the one man to whom a comprehensive scheme of social reform suggested itself.

Other philosophers were engaged in scholastic disputes; statesmen were struggling for the spoils of office; the Calabrian monk alone devoted his energies to creating a scheme of social reorganization. Among all the Italian states, oppressed by foreign rulers and exploited by despotic power, Calabria alone arose in revolt and demanded a new social and political organization. The soul of this struggle was the Calabrian monk — Campanella.

Judged by ordinary standards, the life and teachings of Campanella may seem to mean little to social progress and amelioration. Few to-day know him or his work. The words of Royce, however, certainly apply to him: "Surely no statesman ever founded an enduring social order; one may add that no statesman ever produced even temporarily the exact social order that he meant to

found. No human life ever attained the glorious dreams of its youth. But still the saints and sages are not failures, even if they are forgotten. There is an enduring element about them. They did not wholly die.”¹

¹ Royce, “Spirit of Modern Philosophy,” p. 6.

CHAPTER VI

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY RADICALISM IN FRANCE

1. Morelly is one of the unknown writers. Of his life-history data are extremely rare and on essential points the records are of very uncertain value. He was born at Vitry-le-François at an unknown date. Judging from the opening of his literary activity, he was born about 1720, thus being a contemporary of Rousseau, Voltaire, and the Encyclopædists. As a mark of his obscurity stands the fact that his social theories and writings were for a long time attributed to Diderot. This was done in the biography of Diderot in "France Littéraire" and also in the "Biographie Universelle." Biographers also speak as if there were two writers bearing the name Morelly. As a matter of fact there was only one, the other similar name being in all probability Morelli or Morellet.¹ His leading works were published in connection with the Encyclopædists and in this way he came to be associated with Diderot. The biography of Morelly is, therefore, very limited, and very little is known of his nature or of his works or

¹ Villegardelle, Introduction, "Code de la Nature"; cf. Lichtenberger, "Le Socialisme au XVIII^e Siècle," p. 106.

views except in so far as they can be culled from his writings.

These place Morelly among the great philosophic and political authors of his time in France. Of him one writer says: "With the rebirth of socialist ideas the work attributed to Diderot, but really from the pen of Morelly, took on a new and enlarged importance. Modern writers do not hesitate to acknowledge him with enthusiasm as a forerunner of their theories."¹ Another states that he ranks higher in analytic and constructive power than many of the better-known and acknowledged writers before and since.² Morelly helped to systematize the theories of earlier writers and to pave the way for the later and more developed socialism in France as advanced by Mably, Owen, and Saint-Simon. The importance of such writers as Morelly can be readily underestimated.

As a precursor of the French Revolution and a forerunner of that more systematic and aggressive French socialism, he belongs to that quiet, unobtrusive school of writers which did so much of the bold, original thinking of the prerevolutionary times. He was one of those independent spirits who, in obloquy and neglect, broke with the past, ignored traditions, theological and political prejudices, and proceeded to study human nature in its original condition. He turned

¹ Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

² Villegardelle, *op. cit.*

from vacant superficialities and threadbare generalities back to first principles. He broke through the dead and deadening crust of effete institutions and of antiquated pretensions and got back to man. In his method he was highly introspective, and as a prelude to his social analysis he undertook a study of the human soul.¹ His studies were of that introspective, subjective type which Reich says was characteristic of the radical thought which led to the French Revolution.²

2. Following such writers as Locke and Hobbes in his general method, he reached far different conclusions. He studied that same primitive character after which they all inquired. Other writers, starting out with the same general concepts, but varying in their intent and purpose, surrounded Morelly; and their line of thought being similar, they undoubtedly influenced him. Among this group of radical writers to whose teachings must be traced the roots of the French Revolution, the most prominent and important was Simon Nicolas Henri Linguet.³ Another writer of this school far less brilliant than Linguet and of less importance than

¹ Morelly early published "L'Essai sur le cœur humain," Paris 1745.

² Reich, "Foundations of Modern Europe," London, 1904, pp. 148, 149.

³ On Linguet see Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-131; also "Le Socialisme et la Révolution française"; and Jean Cruppi, "Un avocat journaliste au 18^{me} Siècle, Linguet," Paris, 1895.

Morelly was Jean Claude Chappius. Beaurieu should also be mentioned in this connection.¹ He was one of the ardent advocates of the theory of a state of nature, commending its simplicity and its happiness. His theories were closely allied to the thought of Rousseau, and his work "L'Élève de la Nature" is much like Rousseau's "Émile."² Many such obscure writers were in touch with the still more obscure Morelly and helped to contribute to that mass of radical theorizing which did so much to revolutionize eighteenth-century France. Names of almost household familiarity are also connected with his. Montesquieu and Rousseau, Diderot and Condorcet, with men of far more revolutionary thought, as Helvétius and D'Holbach, were all associated with Morelly in that radical school of thought. It was such men, working silently and unobserved, clothing their thought often in the garb of fiction and romance, who did so much to create revolutionary sentiment and to make a new order possible.

The writings of Morelly on society appeared in the form of fiction to escape the severe censorship of the press then prevalent in France. This seems one leading reason why serious philosophers resorted so much to the form of romance. Under this form were often

¹ These writers have been treated in a very clear manner by André Lichtenberger, "Le Socialisme Utopique." Paris, 1898.

² *Ibid.*, p. 59.

veiled the most radical attacks on existing institutions; while these writers pointed in the most hopeful manner toward a better social structure. True, some works were allowed to circulate freely whose purpose was perfectly clear; many, however, were condemned and burned during the eighteenth century.¹

In the field of general philosophy Morelly left one work of considerable importance, "*L'Essai sur l'esprit humain*," which appeared in 1743. Here he published the theories of education and of the development of the human intellect which have been attributed to Jacotot.

In 1745 appeared his work "*L'Essai sur le cœur humain*." This was the beginning of his social studies. Dealing with the human passions, it contained some of the ideas further elaborated in the extensive system of Fourier. Morelly advanced his social theories in two very important works. The first, the "*Basiliade*," appeared in 1753 as a poetic piece of heroic fiction, in which he lays down his theories in a most general manner.² His second work is shorter and more definite, and bears the title "*Code de la Nature*"; a very significant title when taken in connection with the "natural rights" theories of the time, on which his work is

¹ For a list of condemned works see Rocquain, "*L'Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution, 1715-1789*," Paris, 1878. Here are enumerated between five and six hundred works thus condemned.

² "*Naufrage des îles flottantes ou Basiliade du célèbre Pilpai*."

based.¹ The "Basiliade" was written from 1751-1753. So severely was this criticised that he defended his theories in his stronger, more dogmatic work, "Code de la Nature."² The year in which the "Code" appeared saw Rousseau's noted work of a similar nature, "Discours sur l'inégalité des conditions," while his "Contrat Social" followed almost immediately. Three years before the appearance of the work of Morelly, Montesquieu had begun his inductive study of society and brought a mighty fund of historic knowledge to bear on social problems, attempting an explanation of social progress in terms of physical geography and material environment. In respect to method, Morelly followed Rousseau rather than Montesquieu. In his first work Morelly is more deductive and destructive; in his second, he is more inductive and constructive. Morelly was more constructive than Rousseau; more radical and less scientific than Montesquieu.

Certain other works fall into this group partly because of similarity as to fundamental principles and partly because they approach society from the view point of the social reformer. Among these may be mentioned the important work by D'Holbach, "Nature and

¹ Cf. Cliffe Leslie, "Essays in Political and Moral Philosophy," Dublin, 1879, pp. 150-151.

² "Code de la Nature, ou le véritable esprit de ses lois de tout temps, négligé ou méconnu," 1755.

her Laws." These he considered in their applications to man's social happiness. Condorcet in his "Outlines of the Progress of the Human Mind" is more historical in method and reaches his conclusions by induction. Helvétius in "System of Nature" follows a very materialistic type of social interpretation in contrast to the then dominant social system based so largely upon tradition, authority, and superstition. It was in such teaching that the most serious dangers to the stability of the old régime arose, whether in the realm of religion, politics, or society at large. The "Origins of the Human Understanding," by Condillac, bears the same general stamp and has the same revolutionary tendency in the field of philosophy. A survey of the literature of the time reveals the fact that much of it contemplates the overthrow of the existing social order by denying its philosophic basis and by upsetting faith in those traditions and institutions on which the society of the ancient régime had rested.

Of these writers Morelly was the one who saw most clearly the need of a new system to replace the old, and was the only one who can be called constructive. He alone went so far as to outline a new social structure, meeting, as he thought, the new needs if the ancient society should be overthrown. The others were critical, analytic, and destructive; Morelly laid down a definite plan for new social foundations and may be

called the first constructive socialist in France. He was followed by such builders as Saint-Simon, Fourier, Louis Blanc, and Cabet.¹

One fact that cannot be too much emphasized is the very close relationship between the eighteenth-century social theories and the general philosophy then dominant. It may be said that up to quite recent times social thinking and theorizing were largely incidental and may be called a by-product in the laboratory of the philosopher or the theologian.² It is hence of the utmost importance that a glance be taken at the general philosophic scheme in which the social element was only one of the factors. While this is not the place to speak at any great length of the sceptical philosophy which came to dominate France during the eighteenth century, some discussion of this field, however cursory, is perhaps justified.

The animus of much of this radical teaching was the

¹ As has been before pointed out, a very general interest was awakened in this prerevolutionary literature when this modern French school was developing. Evidence of this lies in the fact that translations of these works appeared in different languages before 1850. The "Code" of Morelly was translated into German by Arndt in 1846. Morelly's social writings were edited in annotated form by Villegardelle in 1841. It is thus evident that this early literature attracted attention later, and was influential in helping to shape the modern socialistic thought.

² This process of differentiation is very interesting to note. In England economics seems to have branched out from theology; in France it has long been classed under the law and has not yet gained entire independence.

desire to overthrow the existing forms of control; it meant an attack upon the absolute monarchy, a protest against an absolute church, and a revolt against an equally absolute social tradition, law, and custom. This thinking, then, had revolution as its purpose, and it had revolution as its results. The writings of Rousseau may be taken as typical of the attack against the state; Meslier and Voltaire early opened war upon religion and the church. D'Holbach, Helvétius, and Volney led the attack in the broad field of general philosophy; while Morelly and Mably represent the most violent enemies of economic order.

In England the writings of Adam Smith present a milder form of protest against the old régime, and, while not adhering to the purposeful revolutionary group, he did more perhaps than any of them to overthrow the old and usher in a new system based upon the most aggressive form of individualism. On the other hand there sprang up a very conservative school in France, whose writings had a marked effect upon the revolutionary thought of the time, and whose work it was to combat the more radical theories. Physiocracy was a great conservative force in French thought. Denying to the state the right to control industry, it was a bulwark of the ancient customs and institutions; and in such writers as Mercier the old order found firm and able advocates.

It may be said in general that there are two lines of philosophic inquiry in the period under discussion; social students and metaphysicians alike indulge in both types of inquiry. One realm belongs more particularly to the metaphysicians, where students inquired into the origin and nature of things; the other set of facts falls into the sphere of psychology, and that of a very deductive type, dealing with the origin and nature of man.¹ This period is marked by a most earnest inquiry after these essentials. Both fields were being seriously investigated in France, and both yielded material for the revolutionary propaganda. The group of materialistic philosophers, including Helvétius, Volney, and D'Holbach, followed one line, hoping to overthrow the then dominant system of thought. The other line of thought was pursued by Condillac, Condorcet, and Diderot, and led more directly to a revolutionary, social, and political philosophy. The radical social teaching of that time and of the later decades is based on certain of these general philosophic concepts. Certain of these ideas of the prerevolutionary writers have a close connection

¹ "Il faut distinguer deux sortes de métaphysique. L'une ambitieuse veut percer tous les mystères: la nature, l'essence d'êtres, les causes; l'autre plus retenue, proportionne ses recherches à la faiblesse de l'esprit humain," etc. — Condillac, "Essai sur l'origine des connoissances humaines; ouvrage où l'on réduit à un seul principe tout ce qui concerne l'entendement humain," Amsterdam, 1746, Vol. 1, p. 2.

with the philosophic principles of later socialism and merit brief notice here.

3. It has come to be very much the mode to connect a materialistic view of life with the teachings of socialism. This charge rests not merely upon the fact that socialism in its efforts toward social betterment has the material welfare of the social classes uppermost in thought, but it also has reference to the philosophic foundations of socialism. It is probable that the statement viewed in either way has much truth in it.

No claim is here made that the materialism of D'Holbach, Helvétius, and the like is the same as that of Weitling, Hegel, or Karl Marx. It is well known that they differ widely, perhaps fundamentally. The attempt is not made here to trace the changes this thought underwent from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century. What can be said with perfect truth, however, is that the radical social theories of the eighteenth century root themselves in the materialistic thought of that age as the more modern socialistic teachings find their philosophic basis in the materialism of the nineteenth century, modified though this latter may be.¹ The close relationship of this early teaching Karl Marx himself set forth.²

¹ Engels, "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," London, 1892, pp. 38 *et seq.*; Seligman, "The Economic Interpretation of History," N. Y., 1902, Chs. 2 and 3.

² "Genau und im prosaischen Sinne zu reden, war die französische Aufklärung des 18 Jahrhunderts nicht nur ein Kampf gegen die

"Yet even here Marx shows the essentially mechanical nature of the older French materialism and points out how the philosophic materialism of Helvétius and D'Holbach led to the socialism of Babeuf and Fourier."¹ Around this point considerable discussion has taken place. One thing, however, is sure, that the social theory of the earlier period sprang from the soil of materialism, — not a historical materialism, but a type that made man a part of the material universe, governed solely and unalterably by her laws, sharing the general natural process and limited by the physical constitution of things. The social and political revolutions in France and in Germany offered the same violent opposition to the orthodox teachings in science, in the state, and in the church.² It was this form of materialism that constituted the philosophical environment of Morelly and his associates. Certain of these writings were very influential in helping to overthrow the old conditions and to lay the foundations of much later radical thinking.³

bestehende Religion und Theologie, sondern ein ausgesprochener Kampf gegen die Metaphysik des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts und gegen alle Metaphysik." — "Die Heilige Familie," p. 196.

¹ Seligman, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.

² Engels, "Ludwig Feuerbach und der Ausgang der klassischen deutschen Philosophie mit anhang: Karl Marx über Feuerbach vom Jahre 1845," Stuttgart, 1895, p. 5.

³ "Fourrier geht von der Lehre der französischen Materialisten aus. Die Babouvisten waren rohe, uncivilisirte Materialisten, aber auch

4. Perhaps the clearest statement of these theories comes from the pen of D'Holbach. He puts the case baldly as follows: "In short, morals and politics will be equally enabled to draw from materialism advantages which the dogma of spirituality can never supply, of which it even precludes the idea. Man will ever remain a mystery to those who obstinately persist in viewing him with eyes prepossessed by metaphysics, he will always be an enigma to those who shall pertinaciously attribute his actions to a principle of which it is impossible to form to themselves any distinct idea."¹ One such quotation shows, long before Marx or Buckle, a studied intention to give a very decided materialistic direction to social interpretation. He further says: "If the intellectual faculties of man or his moral qualities be examined, according to the principles here laid down, the conviction must be complete that they are to be attributed to material causes."²

Of a more marked type is the materialism as taught by Helvétius. He advances in the boldest form the *der entwickelte Communismus* datirt direkt von dem französischen Materialismus. Dieser wandert nämlich in der Gestalt die ihm Helvétius gegeben hat nach seinem Mutterlande, nach England zurück. Bentham gründet auf die Moral des Helvétius sein System des wohlverstandnen Interesses, wie Owen, von dem System Bentham ausgehend, den Englischen Communismus begründet." — Marx, "Die Heilige Familie," p. 207.

¹ D'Holbach, "Nature and her Laws, as applicable to the happiness of man living in society," London, 1816, Vol. I, p. 211.

² *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 215.

theory of the domination of the material forces and their close control over man's actions, considered individually and socially. He denies all supernatural causes and emphasizes only the real, the tangible. "Man is the work of nature and subject to her laws from which he cannot free himself, nor even exceed in thought."¹ He denied any distinction between man as a moral and as a physical being. Man is controlled by necessity; but this is physical and not moral necessity.

Outside the realm of physical necessity there is no control.² There is, therefore, in the teaching of Helvétius, no room for crime nor its punishment. Man is not responsible to society, ruled as he is by nature whose laws are absolute over him. Society, being merely a group of separate individuals, is likewise subject to the absolute laws of nature. The ends of society are those proposed by nature, and these alone man is obliged to carry out. The end of life, both social and individual, is happiness. "The final end of man is self-preservation and rendering existence happy. . . . The spring of all action in man are corporeal pains and pleasures."³ Nowhere is the pain-and-pleasure philosophy stated

¹ "True Meaning of System of Nature," translated from the French, London, 1820, Ch. I.

² *Ibid.*, Ch. VI.

³ "System of Nature," Ch. IX; also, "Treatise on Man, his intellectual faculties and his education," translated from the French, London, 1810, Ch. X.

more unreservedly. "Corporeal pleasure and pain are the real and only springs of all government."

The ends of society and law should be to control the members so that social good will follow; but the final test will be the happiness of the individual. "It is by promoting the happiness of other men that we engage them to promote our own." So that while much of our activity seems socially directed, it rests finally upon selfishness, and the facts which determine social action are tested by the pleasure and pain of the individual. Evil is necessary in man, that he may know the good; and man at first did evil that he might add to his happiness. The end of government and society is found in immediate benefit to the individual; and these are measured in terms of pleasure and pain. Man's actions and choice, while governed by necessity, are still a result of his reason. There is, therefore, a rational element in human action. The final test of all action is nature, tempered by reason.

Helvétius already perceives the effect of physical environment in giving rise to the differences of peoples. The moist, soggy air of England makes a people of duller wits and of much less vivacity than in Spain, where a bright dry air has had its effect upon individual and national character.¹ Such was the thought of one of the most influential of the contemporaries of Morelly,

¹ "Treatise on Man," English translation, 1810, p. 161.

on the nature of man and of things. It illustrates what has been pointed out as the great revolutionary tendency of the time to break with the past, to abandon authority and tradition and return to a study of man in his primitive qualities.

In the writings of such psychologists as Condillac¹ and Condorcet² appear the same tendencies toward the materialistic teaching. The writings of De Maistre are of less importance in this regard. They are largely theological in tone and deal only slightly with the materialistic or revolutionary aspects of the case.³

These ideas which enter so largely into the revolutionary thought of the early period appear in the socialistic writings after the Revolution. The tendency to found a social science upon a basis of materialism; to explain social phenomena in terms of material science; and to discover the lines of physical, moral, and social causation in the same sphere, — this tendency marks the writings of Saint-Simon, August Comte, and other Frenchmen. Of this Ferraz says: "The physicism of Saint-Simon and the positivism of Comte are in close accord with the materialism of D'Holbach and of Lamettrie, and the doctrine of the 'attraction

¹ "Essai sur l'origine des connoissances humaines." 1746.

² "Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain, suivie de réflexions sur l'esclavage des nègres." Paris, 1822.

³ Ferraz, "Socialisme, Naturalisme et Positivisme," Paris, 1882, p. xvi; Flint, "History of the Philosophy of History," N. Y., 1894, p. 342.

passionelle' is based upon the philosophy of Helvétius. In many ways the present socialism rests upon the sensualism of the eighteenth century."¹

There is a more restricted sense in which the writings and actions of this age may be called materialistic. This period was marked by the growth of the desire for material welfare. It is now coming to be more fully appreciated that the French Revolution was caused as well by bad harvests and empty stomachs as by radical philosophy and revolutionary teaching.² In the literature here cited the test of happiness is largely a material one. Helvétius said the stomach and sexual passion were the main motives leading men to action. The age was marked by that type of individual philosophy, wherein the welfare, *i.e.* the pleasure and pain of the individual, was the final test of the good or evil in the social structure. The pleasure-and-pain philosophy has this as its corollary, that individualism and the demand for material welfare go hand in hand.³

5. Growing logically out of the foregoing materialistic view is another feature peculiar in some of its aspects to the age of Morelly; *i.e.* the emphasis laid upon the metaphysical concepts of the "law of nature," of "natural rights," and their corollaries.

¹ "Socialisme, Naturalisme et Positivisme," p. xv.

² Cf. Lichtenberger, "Le Socialisme et la Révolution française."

³ Held, "Zwei Bücher zur sozialen Geschichte Englands," 1881, p. 85.

It is almost a commonplace to speak of the natural rights theory as being dominant at this time in France. All through the literature of that period are scattered the phrases, "state of nature," "natural rights," "man of nature," "natural law." These phrases came most freely from the pens of social, political, and psychological writers of the time. [The tendency then dominant was to study man himself, independent of environment, of culture, of civilization itself, and of all the effects and influences of the centuries of historical evolution.]

The period of Morelly was thoroughly dominated by this state of nature philosophy. [These natural rights were presumed to be the natural and inalienable heritage of every person born into society.] Even though born into conventional society, he came as heir to these rights.

The general theory of a state of nature and of the laws supposed to govern there are too familiar to require extensive reference. These doctrines were made particularly prominent in the writings of Rousseau, especially in his "Contrat Social." They appear in a more abstract and scientific form in the philosophical works of that radical group already discussed, including Helvétius, D'Holbach, Condorcet, and others; while it is the accepted premise of such socialist writers as Mably, Morelly, Boissel, and Babeuf. This same

theory was taken up by the early American radicals and appropriated to their revolutionary purposes.

The conception of man in a state of nature, accepted by the early French socialists, was much different from that advanced by Hobbes. The "man of nature," discussed by the French writers, is pictured as living in a state of peace, happiness, and undisturbed equality. The natural man, as set forth by Hobbes, was in a state of constant warfare, where groups struggled in conditions of anarchy till fear and despair drove them to organize society and to submit to government. Not that they freely sought conventional society or yielded gladly to the sovereign will of such society so organized as to express its will through the organs of the state, but that they betook themselves to these as a refuge from worse things.

The French theory corresponds more nearly with that of Locke. These writers hold that men enter into society and establish and submit to a government, not so much to avoid a state of war, as to gain larger benefits through association and to reach positive ends not attainable through individual effort.¹ This idea of nature and man's place in it forms one of the main premises in the socialistic thought of the age of Morelly.

While this doctrine is not confined in its influence to

¹ Cf. *Helvétius*, "True Meaning of the System of Nature," p. 24.

the prerevolutionary period, and did not find its origin there, it is given a peculiar conciseness and a greater emphasis in these radical works. The most unreserved statement of the theory is found in the "System of Nature," where Helvétius clearly states the relation of man to nature and her laws. Of man's place in nature he says: "Man is a physical being, subject to nature, and hence to necessity. . . . The necessity that governs the physical governs the moral world, where everything is also subject to the same law. . . . Notwithstanding the system of human liberty, men have universally founded their systems upon necessity alone."¹ His conception of man is not, however, lowered because of his subjection to natural law; human actions in society are not then made more servile or less noble because of this control. [Man and society both conform to this higher law of nature. Man loses nothing in self-respect, in feelings of responsibility, nor in his desire for virtue, as a result. Punishment would cease as a social function and would follow through the execution of the law of nature. Vice and disorder would decrease. Thus does Helvétius restate the old theory of man's relation to nature.]

In various forms this theory is found in the radical literature down to the Revolution. Adam Smith

¹ "True Meaning of the System of Nature," pp. 16-17.

accepts it.¹ Condorcet enlarges on it.² Turgot clearly expresses his acceptance of this doctrine, which must be viewed as one of the premises of the social theories in the age of Morelly.³ This idea of a state of nature and its corollaries form as important a tenet in the argument of the radical social thinkers as it did with the political doctrinaires. It gave ground for the fundamental principle, as important to one set of revolutionists as to the other, that men are born free and equal; a notion with as great consequences for the social order as it had for the permanence of the existing political régime. "Almost all the ancient philosophers and politicians laid it down as a principle that men are born unequal; that nature has created some to be free, others to be slaves."⁴ The eighteenth-century theory as to man's equality repudiates the doctrine first advanced by Aristotle, and taught that all men are by nature free and equal. Carried out in the realm of politics this makes for democracy; in the realm of industry and economics it would mean socialism.

6. A very natural corollary to this type of thinking was an almost total disregard for history. Writers of this class were decidedly unhistorical in their method of

¹ Hasbach, "Untersuchungen über Adam Smith und die Entwicklung der politischen Oekonomie," pp. 322 *et seq.*, Leipzig, 1891.

² "Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain," pp. 91 *et seq.*

³ Leon Say, "Turgot," pp. 43-44.

⁴ Volney, "The Ruins," English ed., 1881, p. 144.

social analysis. They studied man as a creature aside from his historical development and separated from historical environment. To them man was marked by unchanging qualities, and history had little of importance to teach concerning him or his social possibilities. Against the idea that man is an historical product stood the theory of revolution that history had perverted man's best faculties, while his truly social qualities were those that were native, inherent, and hence independent of historical development.¹ Human nature remaining always essentially the same, mankind should be organized in such manner as would best fit this type, reached purely by *a priori* reasoning. The French Revolution was a movement to which, then, history was to bring little or no aid. The attitude of the radical school was well stated in the aphorism of the French statesman, who said he could learn nothing from history.

There had as yet been very little knowledge, of a trustworthy kind, of those conditions of life which they pretended to describe. The treatment of primitive society as found in Cantillon, whereby he attempted to reach social origins, is a good illustration of the early research, well characterized by James Stewart as "conjectural history." Eighteenth-century social study, very deductive in its nature, had little use for history.

¹ Dunning, "History of Political Theory," Vol. I, p. 293.

It dealt with the pleasing fiction of this happy state of nature and this man of nature, "a natural, permanent, universal thing"; and here there could be no changing history. Only the changeful, fleeting, artificial, could pass through those cycles which make history possible. These writers viewed things with the eye of a metaphysician, which sees things in a static state where history is not made.¹ The theories here discussed deal with man and not with men; and man, thus conceived of, has no history. These theories deal with an abstract man. From Adam Smith to Kant, from Rousseau to Mably, the treatises present this interesting abstraction. What Barrès says of Kant was equally true of these radicals, "He addresses himself to an abstract and ideal person always and everywhere the same; whereas the real man, the only man we have to live with, varies according to time, place, and race."² The social philosophers also dealt with a type of man that was not supposed to vary. He is the natural person, and as they have stripped him of all the effects of the past and taken him "shivering naked from the hand of nature," the task of rebuilding society from top to bottom need not be so difficult.

From a practical as well as from a philosophic cause these reformers must deny the value of history and

¹ See Engels, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

² Le Bon, "The Psychology of Socialism," N. Y., 1899, p. 72.

attempt to destroy its results. Of this Nitti remarks: "This was one of the hardest problems the world had yet met. The question seemed to be, how to make it possible for the masses to partake in the benefits of a society, where the society itself rested chiefly on aristocracy, and the traditional institutions could be safe only when resting on such a basis. In such a case it seemed natural that much of the validity of past development must be denied, in that it shut the masses from its enjoyment; one of those historical institutions vigorously attacked was property."¹ Thus the coming either of socialism or of democracy demanded the rejection of the ancient structure and the reduction of society to its primitive elements, in order to clear the ground and allow the population to flow freely from the old into the new social and political mould. This fact made the position of the radical reformers logical in rejecting history and its results and rendered the destructiveness of the French Revolution necessary.

It is quite evident that the type of socialism here treated must largely ignore historical considerations. The methods of reform suggested by the utopian socialists make historical evolution particularly unnecessary. They did not look for slow growth and change. They did not expect to pave the way by moderate measure. Socialism was conceived of as a

¹ Nitti, "Le Socialisme Catholique," p. 4.

finished state and not as a process; an end and not a means. Their view was revolutionary and not evolutionary. With the simple primitive man as a unit these social dreamers hoped to construct *de novo* an ideal society.

This meant that no idea of social evolution entered their thoughts. Their "man" was to have only "tendencies," and these they conceived of as "social or benevolent tendencies" alone. They thought of human nature as a *tabula rasa*. The theory of innate ideas was rejected. Morelly assumed a "man of nature." Rousseau accepted the primitive-man theory as advanced by Mrs. Behn and made a "Bon Sauvage" the hopeful unit for his social and political reconstruction. The natural man, discussed by Godwin, was one to whom all historical development meant nothing. Man was not to grow out of the past — indeed, was to have no vital connection with it. To Morelly the effects of past progress were especially pernicious. The whole attitude of eighteenth-century socialism was antagonistic to history and inappreciative of historical progress.¹

As has been indicated, this attitude toward history is one of the leading distinctions between utopian and

¹ "Historical man is always human society and the presumption of a presocial or supersocial man is a creature of imagination." — Labriola, "Socialism and Philosophy," p. 43.

scientific socialism. Rodbertus and Marx were both devoted to the historical method. Marx based his whole system on a study of the historical evolution of industrial society. Of Rodbertus, Gonner says: "If we distinguish social writers into those who employ abstract and those who employ historical analysis as a means of investigation, Rodbertus must certainly be placed among the latter. History furnishes him with the foundation on which he builds."¹

From the standpoint of these reformers the age was specially fitted to suggest such an attitude toward history. Conditions of political despotism, religious dogmatism, and social and industrial misery and wrong, were productive of the spirit of radical innovation and led to an abandonment of history the most complete. The results of historical development, as seen in eighteenth-century France, argued little for history as a guide or for its products as the basis of a regenerated society. Within the pale of that civilization which seemed the highest fruits of history, the critics saw little of inspiration or of promise. Refuge was therefore sought in the vague, metaphysical region of a "state of nature." Here was found the promising idea of a man of nature, living in a simple state, enjoying certain primitive rights, at least free from conventional wrongs and endowed with "natural goodness" and with

¹ "The Social Philosophy of Rodbertus," p. 33.

the capacity of "perfectibility"} most happy conditions for the reformer as a basis for an ideal social state.

Such was the utopian dream of the eighteenth-century metaphysician in the realm of social reform. It corresponds to the idea entertained by the classical economists when they proceeded in theory to do wonders with the myth of the "economic man" in the sphere of "free competition." Very similar was the use made of the two concepts. This man of nature was free from the restraints and limitations of an artificial kind, which had grown up with progress. Against the morals of tradition and authority were set the morals of nature. Against the doctrine of the inherent evil of human nature was placed the dogma of man's native goodness. Opposed to the hampering regulations of the old order was the liberty of the new age of reason; the rational judgment opposed to the historic judgment. Much in the same manner had the classical economics fallen back to the law of nature in the industrial world, and on that basis had combated the traditional theories and had opposed the remaining limitations of the old system of mercantilism.

There is, however, another principle involved in these theories, closely related to the foregoing. The underlying idea in this teaching was the possibility of an artificial social structure. It ignores the fact that

society is an organism and, growing under the operation of natural economic laws, is dynamic and not static; that it is not the product of closet philosophers, but develops in a slow and continuing process. The idea accepted by later socialism of the Marxian type, is that society evolves into new if not into higher forms, following its own inherent laws and beyond the control of the members of society, exerted individually or collectively — an idea which ill comports with the philosophic society-builders of any age.

The teachings, then, of this earlier socialism lack the evolutionary notion, and hence the idea of progress, as now conceived. In fact, before the more recent times, when the study of physical science has given a scientific bent to social study, there was very little to suggest progress. Jowett says: "Passing from speculation to facts we observe that progress has been the exception rather than the rule in human history. And therefore we are not surprised that the idea of progress is of a modern rather than of an ancient date; and like the idea of a philosophy of history is not more than a century old. It seems to have arisen from the impressions left in the human mind by the growth of the Roman Empire and of the Christian Church, and to be due to the local and political improvements they introduced into the world; and still more in our own century to the idealism of the French Revolution and to the triumph of the

American Revolution; and in a greater degree to the material prosperity and growth of population in England and America.”¹ This difference in attitude of the French radicals marks the chief distinction between the English and French Revolutions.

A brief study of the documents of the English Revolution serves to show that the demands there made are for historic rights; they fall back to the past and demand their ancient liberties secured for centuries by the constitutions and laws of England. As compared with the French Revolution it was superficial in nature. The English radicals did not go back of the political structure. They did not, with few exceptions, attack society. They accepted the social fabric as a product of historical development and were satisfied to reconstruct a new political organization.² Property, the laws of its holding and distribution, the family and the existing industrial order — all these were left intact.

In France, however, the whole movement was different. Not political but social in its nature, it went deeper. The demand in France was not for historical but for natural rights. The metaphysician and philosopher and not the legalist or historian laid the basis of

¹ Introduction to “Republic” of Plato, p. ccxiii.

² Cf. Gooch, “History of English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century,” Cambridge, 1898, Ch. IV.

the French revolutionary struggle. They did not hope for relief through a return to ancient liberties nor historic rights; they looked for a totally new social reconstruction. The French wished to fall back of organized society and sweep away its fabric till nothing but the individual remained. From this they would reconstruct society. In this lay the dangerous feature of the early French thought. Here is seen its kinship with socialism. It worked toward a great social movement deep enough to disturb the social foundations.

The radicals in France attacked the underlying economic and industrial order and created new social classes and destroyed old ones; this necessarily upset the equilibrium in society and made the Revolution necessary.¹ From the writings of Rousseau, Morelly, Mably, and the like down to the laws of the Assembly of 1793 may be seen in theory and in practice this far-reaching attack on the traditional institutions and on the historic order. As Professor Reich says: "The changes in France were *tabula rasa*. It was a Revolution totally unlike the great revolutions of the Dutch in 1565-1569, of the English 1642-1660, or of the American from 1775-1783. In no one of these three revolutions were the social, *i.e.* the deeper, elements of the

¹ Cf. Barnave, "Introduction à la Révolution française," edited by Béranger, London, 1843, p. 20.

nation touched upon; all three referred to political issues, leaving the rest of the nation's organization untouched."¹ In France it was intended that society as well as government should receive a new constitution. Back of the radical revolutionary action was this thoroughgoing revolutionary thought, part of which has been called socialistic.

It may then be conceded in that so far as socialism has to do with the abstract and unchanging principles of social justice, and with the supposed immutable laws of right, it would not lead to an historical study of society. This much can be said, that the study of social history and the rise of the evolutionary doctrines, as accepted either by Hegel or Darwin, must be fatal to the earlier idealistic type of socialism. It is also true that modern state and scientific socialism has been very closely allied to the historical school of economics.²

Just what the effect of the study of history and the acceptance of the doctrines of evolution have had on socialism in theory it is difficult to say. Karl Marx, after a most profound study of industrial history, and accepting the Hegelian theory of evolution, abandoned the radical type of socialism and founded scientific socialism. It was in the light of the evolutionary doctrine that Herbert Spencer wrote his most telling

¹ "Foundations of Modern Europe," pp. 118-119.

² Rambaud, "Histoire d'Économie Politique," Paris, 1900, p. 326.

defence of the individual in his "*Man versus the State*." In the congress of scientists in Berlin in 1877 the famous discussion between Virchow and Haeckel involved the wisdom of socialism viewed in the light of the evolutionary theory of Darwin. The results seemed to show that a strict adherence to the evolutionary doctrine would exclude socialism.

The great scholar Savigny, who first applied the historic method to the study of law, was very doubtful of the success of extensive social control. On the fluctuating nature of law he says, "Accordingly legislation itself and jurisprudence as well are of a wholly accidental and fluctuating nature and it is very possible that the law of to-day may not be the law of to-morrow."¹ After this statement of the nature of law he says, "The conviction that there is a practical law of nature or of reason, an ideal legislation for all times and all circumstances, which we have only to discover to bring positive law to perfection, often served only to reconcile the views as to the civil code and growing law." Here he examines the origins of legislation to test this idea. The general drift of his discussion as to the possibility of establishing permanent relationships through positive law is unfavorable. As to the effect of his study upon his ideas of social control Ihering

¹ "Of the Vocation of our Age for Legislation and Jurisprudence," London, 1831, p. 23.

says,¹ "It feeds him with the hope that things will take care of themselves and that the best he can do is to fold his arms and confidently wait for what may gradually spring to light from that primitive source of all law so-called, — the natural conviction of legal right. Hence his aversion, and all his disciples, for the interference of legislation."

7. Another feature of the social philosophy of Morelly was his unbounded optimism. Pessimism as to conditions, optimism as to possibilities, sums up in a phrase the creed of early socialism. Of this period of expectation a French critic says: "It has inspired the political philosophy of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It produced after the Revolution the theories of the socialist schools while it has done much to nourish contemporaneous socialism."² Nitti describes it as follows, "Toward the close of the last century there spread over the whole of Europe from France, not only the theories that proclaimed the new social faith, but also, and not less extensively, the most absolute trust in the goodness of natural laws and in human perfection and perfectibility."³

Here, then, is the basis of that optimism which marks the eighteenth-century thought: unbounded faith in

¹ "The Struggle for Law," translated from German, Chicago, 1879, p. 14.

² Renouvier, "Schopenhauer et le Pessimisme," p. 5.

³ Nitti, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

the beneficent control of the natural laws; in the doctrine of human goodness; in the idea of progress and the possibility of a social solidarity — all these factors figure in that sentiment of hopefulness which characterized the decades preceding the French Revolution.

All types of writing are colored by it; works on commerce and economics, on law and politics, on psychology and metaphysics. Psychology, dealing with man's inherent qualities, reached the conclusion that he was not bad, but innately good. The economic writers saw the disappearance of the Age of Mercantilism, with its wars and strife, and prophesied the new era of peace, when trade should be untrammelled and industry go on unhindered to better days. The great philosopher, Kant, expressed his faith in new-born democracy in his happy dream, "Zum ewigen Frieden,"¹ telling how the new system would banish war. Until the Revolution these hopes kept bright. Hopes in political reform and social regeneration; hopes in economic prosperity, when there should be universal freedom in commercial relations; hopes in the liberation of the human mind from thralldom, and in a higher morality based on reason as the highest expression of nature's laws — some such hopes mark the closing decades of the eighteenth century.

This optimism of which Morelly and his associates

¹ Kant, "Zum ewigen Frieden," 1804.

partake rests rather upon metaphysical reasoning than upon theological dogmatizing. During the eighteenth century, owing largely to the attacks made upon theology by Meslier and Voltaire, and to the rise of the school of mathematics under Leibnitz, and the school of psychology under Condorcet, the theological type of optimism gives way to the metaphysical, and the schools of socialism, politics, and economics accept, in a little different form, the belief in the final good issue of all things.¹ It may be said that the idea of the benevolent will of a Supreme Being has been replaced by the concept of the laws of nature, which were also thought of as benevolent. This is true for illustration of the physiocrats of whom Ritchie says, "The theory of the physiocrats, that man ought to study natural law and not disturb its actions, assumes that nature is operating in a way that is beneficial to man."² The same may be said of the teachings of Adam Smith. "The law of nature becomes with him an article of religious faith; the principles of human nature, in accordance with the nature of their Divine Author, necessarily tend to the most beneficial employments of man's faculties and resources."³

¹ Renouvier, *op. cit.*, p. 45; Bonar, "Philosophy and Political Economy," pp. 99 *et seq.*

² Ritchie, "Natural Rights," a criticism of some political and ethical conceptions, London, 1895, p. 45.

³ Cliffe Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

Naturally connected with this was the additional idea that, under this general law, the public and individual interests could be reconciled. The theory that the social and individual ends and purposes may, if properly adjusted, be made to coincide, is a necessary postulate of all socialist doctrine; else it must mean the destruction of individual liberty or a lessening of social welfare. The age here under discussion saw the rise of this happy sentiment. It became an axiom of the science with many economists and with English statesmen, that, by a natural law, the private interests harmonize with the interests of the public. This proposition underlies the social and economic theories of the classical economists; it is the hope of the radical social reformers in France, and a main tenet of the physiocrats. Of the attitude of Adam Smith on this question Professor Veblen says, "Both in the 'Theory of Moral Sentiments' and in his 'Wealth of Nations' there are many passages that testify to his abiding conviction that there is a wholesome trend in the natural course of things, and the characteristically optimistic tone in which he speaks for natural liberty is but an expression of this conviction."¹

Ample illustrations of this attitude may be found in all the literature of the time. Hume says, "The interests

¹ "Journal of Political Economy," Vol. XIII, p. 396.

of others are, on the whole, in the case of nearly every man, stronger than even his own self-interest.”¹ Hutcheson, in his “System of Moral Philosophy,” discusses at length the innate principles of benevolence.² Burke, in his “Sublime and Beautiful,” distinguishes two fundamental lines of action, those of self-preservation and social interest.³ Adam Ferguson sees the natural condition of social union coming from a very high and altruistic origin.⁴

Volney, in his too little read classic, “Les Ruines,” sets forth the same happy theory of the possible harmony between the general and particular interests. He teaches that these interests are not naturally in conflict. If society were properly organized, harmony and not discord would result. Not only this, he taught the notion of a larger possible union of interests that underlay the cosmopolitan economics of the classical school. Society at large, having passed through the same stages that particular societies have done, promises the same close union on a larger scale. “At first separated in its parts each individual stood alone, and this intellectual solitude constituted its childhood.”⁵ In this more perfect society “individuals will feel that private happiness is allied to the happiness of society.”⁶

¹ “Works,” Vol. III, p. 54. ² Published in 1748. ³ 1756.

⁴ “Essay on the History of Civil Society,” Boston, 1809, pp. 1-3.

⁵ Volney, “Les Ruines,” p. 48. ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

In this theory the social and individual welfare were not incompatible.¹

8. It has always been argued that the possibilities of socialism and its practical success are conditioned on the nature of man himself. The phrase has grown old in service that water can rise no higher than its source and that society, regardless of its structure, can be no better than the units which compose it. Like all epigrams this one is dangerous and may easily be untrue. However, the faith in schemes of social reform will be determined largely by the theories held concerning man's nature and possibilities. In this regard a study of the beliefs of this period is enlightening.

One of the underlying ideas in the schemes of reform of the last half of the eighteenth century was the theory of the native goodness of man. The schemes of ideal societies and model commonwealths and utopian states were justified by the dogma of primitive goodness. Man, taken as the unit of society, must be perfect, or at least perfectible. In that state of nature where men were happy there must be lacking those evils which curse conventional society. The propo-

¹ Cf. Roscher, "Principles of Political Economy," English translation, p. 79; Boisguilbert, "Factum de la France," Daire edition, Ch. 10; J. B. Say, "Traité d'Économie," p. 15; Bentham, "Treatise," Vol. I, p. 229.

In poetry, cf. Werner, "Passing Century"; cf. Coar, "Studies in German Literature," p. 9.

sitions accepted by the radical thinkers were, that man in a state of nature was benevolent and with proper social environment might be kept so. The discussion took shape in the denial of the theory of innate ideas, the acceptance of the doctrine of primitive goodness, and the environment theory of evil.

One of the clearest features in the works of this kind was the denial of the doctrine of innate ideas. These writers deny that man comes into society with any other mental furnishings than the tendency to be and to do. This doctrine was a favorite one with Morelly and on it he parted company with Locke. It is this fact that formed the basis of the environment theory, made so much of by these early writers and which was the corner-stone of the social theory of Robert Owen.

Of these philosophers the teachings of Helvétius are perhaps clearest and most positive and may be cited as typical of the school on this point. He denied the existence of innate ideas. Man's actions are neither to be explained nor controlled by appeal to internal forces. Knowledge is a result of sensation. The environment, therefore, with which man comes in contact makes him what he is.¹ Education, a fit social environment, the proper training of the young — these things make for a perfect social state. "The ideas

¹ Peabody, "Jesus Christ and Christian Character," etc., N. Y. 1905, pp. 9-10.

supposed to be innate are those that are familiar to and as it were incorporated with us; they are the effect of education, example, and habit.”¹ In this theory man is entirely without inherent moral qualities. “Moral ideas are a result of experience alone. Judgment presupposes sensibility and judgment itself is the fruit of comparison.”² Happiness is the uniform object of all the passions. These are legitimate and natural and can be called neither good nor bad, only in so far as they are a social cause or force. To direct the passions toward virtue it is necessary to convince mankind of its advantages. Such were the general teachings of Helvétius.

Of the same nature is the teaching of D’Holbach. “Every sensation, then, is nothing more than a shock given to the organs; every perception is this shock propagated to the brain; every idea is the image of the object to which the sensation and perception are ascribed.”³ “Such are the only means by which man receives sensations, perceptions, and his ideas.”⁴ The same general theory may be found in Volney. Morelly in like manner denies the whole theory of innate ideas and of inherent evil. He denies that man has any natural tendency toward evil or any spirit of jealousy or disorder.

¹ “System of Nature,” p. 15.

² *Ibid.*

³ “Nature and her Laws,” Vol. I, p. 189.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

Thus was the theory of innate ideas denied, and the doctrine of primitive goodness took shape in the minds of the French philosophers. This doctrine, however, was not original with these writers though accepted by them and employed in their radical social teachings and actions. From a historical standpoint this period of native goodness had been reckoned in terms of the chronology of ethical development. To primitive peoples, anterior to the period of culture, this goodness is attributed. Thus, in theological teachings, the period of perfection is placed at the beginning of things and the world moves away from it.

In early profane writings the same idea of perfection obtains. For instance, Cicero says: "The earliest races of mankind, as yet free from evil passions, lived without reproach, without sin, and without the necessity of either punishment or coercion. But after a time this original state of equality disappeared and ambition and force took the place of modesty and simplicity."¹ This is not the theory, however, as held by the philosophers. To them the time element is not of importance. It was to them a logical and not a chronological consideration. It is true they taught that the golden age was in the past and that civilization, as they saw it, was a departure from it. But, as has been pointed out, they thought in terms of metaphysics and not of history.

¹ "Republic," Bk. V, Ch. 3.

Their idea was to clear away the product of development and you would find the inherent goodness of man still existent. The writings of the time constantly speak of reversion to the native or primitive condition of man. This was the idea of Rousseau, Condillac, Morelly, and their associates. As has been pointed out, this type of socialism is reactionary. It finds a representative in England in recent time where William Morris advises a return to the early feudal type of social structure.

This eighteenth-century idea of goodness finds its source partly in the romance of travel which dealt in most instances sympathetically with the primitive life of savage peoples. The writings of the Jesuits, of Rousseau, and Mrs. Aphra Behn are largely responsible for this interest in folk-culture. To Mrs. Behn, Rousseau owed the concept and the expression, "Le Bon Sauvage." According to Lichtenberger this was the main contribution of this rather remarkable woman to social science.¹ She expressed the doctrine that primitive man was happy because he conformed to nature's laws and lived in a state of simplicity.² She stirred up interest in the study of this man of nature and what he might enjoy if left to develop naturally. She gave the suggestion, developed by later writers, that man is not inherently bad; that he is by nature good and has

¹ "Le Socialisme Utopique," pp. 21-23. ² *Ibid.*, p. 23.

social instincts; that he is not the fierce, warlike creature described by Hobbes; not the uncomely being satirized by Defoe; but rather a moral, benevolent type, following nature in his native simplicity.¹

Thus briefly stated are some of the features of that hopeful philosophy of the eighteenth century which led the reformers to believe in man as a perfectible being, fit subject for a more perfect social and political condition. Such was a most useful concept to any scheme of social perfection; as a logical conclusion to the "state of nature" philosophy, it encouraged the destruction of existing forms. When the test of the validity of existing social institutions was their conformity to natural law, and when it seemed apparent that society had not evolved according to this law, a long step was taken toward revolution. When along with the theory of goodness was placed the idea that evil arose from environment, and this in the sense of social environment, then the field was cleared for a very radical change in this environment. With such hopeful theories entertained, it was not unusual that dreams of ideal states came to those philosophic minds. "It is a logical necessity of the human mind to model a thing perfectly which will and must show its imperfections in the

¹ On Mrs. Behn, see Gildon, "History of Life and Memoirs of Mrs. Behn," 1863; "Plays, Histories, and Novels," etc., 6 vols., London, 1871. Julia Kavanah, "English Women of Letters," Vol. I.

execution. Hence it has been that before there have been practical schemes and workable plans there have been totally impractical dreams and utopian societies.”¹

9. Of the utmost interest and importance in the history of this radical thought are those theories dealing with the property right. Before the Revolution the discussion took a legal, juristic direction, treating of the most general ideas of property. Later study was applied more minutely to value and value-production and the equities arising from the economic process. The earlier views are found discussed in Locke, while Ricardo is credited with originating the surplus-value theory of Karl Marx, whose property-theory rests upon the concept of value-production.

John Locke stated the labor-theory of property in his famous work, “Two Treatises of Government.” According to Locke property emerges and property-rights find their justification when labor has been expended on useless material things.² Students of

¹ Emerson, “Representative Men,” London, 1850, p. 135.

² “Though the earth and all inferior creatures be common to all men, yet every man has a property in his own person. This nobody has any right to but himself. The labor of his body and the work of his hands we may say are properly his. Whatsoever he redeems out of the state nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his labor with it, and joined to it something that is his own and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state nature placed it in it hath by this labor something annexed to it that excludes the common right of other men. For this labor being

Marx will find this not far from true Marxian doctrine. Locke does not call value "congealed labor," but this phrase practically sums up his theory. Locke's property theory is entirely in accord with the "natural rights" doctrine as later elaborated.¹ Natural law limits the extent to which the rights of property may go;² the degrees of usefulness being the standard by which to judge.³

Grotius differed fundamentally with Locke as to the origin of property rights. He saw no virtue in labor as the origin of property-right. Neither the expenditure of labor nor the sacrifice involved in labor had any connection with either the right of property or with the addition of values. He did not recognize the creation of form-values; nor could labor, added to raw material, change its status. Being of a legal turn of mind his inquiry did not extend further than the fact of present

the unquestionable property of the laborer, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to; at least there is enough and as good left in common for others. The labor that was mine removing them out of that common state hath fixed my property in them." — "Two Treatises of Government," Vol. II, Ch. V.

¹ "The original law of nature for the beginning of property in what was before common still takes place." — "Two Treatises of Government," Vol. II, Ch. V.

² "The same law of nature which by this means gives us property does also bound that property."

³ "As much as any one can make use of before it spoils, so much he may by his labor fix a property in."

possession which he claimed could originally be gained chiefly by first occupancy.¹

As Locke had discussed property from the side of labor or from the standpoint of production, Pufendorf considered it from the utility or consumption view point. His point of departure was the existence of the needs of man. He adhered to the "right of subsistence" theory discussed above. The fact of human wants presumes man's right to control the necessary things for their satisfaction. Pufendorf denied that there were inherent rights to property. Property does not exist in a state of nature; it is therefore a result of the development of institutions.² Property arises merely as a result of convention, agreement, law, whereby dominion over certain things is fixed in one person. According to Pufendorf when man left the state of nature, he did not take the institution of property nor even the instinct of property with him into society.³ Property was the

¹ "Our business here then is to treat of taking possession by right of prior occupancy; which since those times just mentioned is the only natural and primitive manner of acquisition." — "Rights of War and Peace," Bk. II, Ch. 3.

² "And therefore 'tis an idle question, whether the property of things arise from nature or from institution; since we have plain evidence that it proceeds from the imposition of men." — "Law of Nature and of Nations," Bk. IV, Ch. 4.

³ "Property is the result of an agreement. Therefore the property of things flowed immediately from the compact of men either tacit or expressed." — *Op. cit.*

result of social evolution and did not exist in primitive conditions.¹

According to Hobbes there 'was no idea of property before institutions arose. Man in his primitive state had no property. In speaking of the relation of justice to injustice he says these things arise out of social organization. Property he treats in the same way. "It is consequent therefore to the same conditions that there be no propriety, no dominion, no mine and thine distinct; but only that to be every man's that he can get and so long as he can keep it."² In a state of nature, every man has a right to everything. Property depends upon the institution of the coercive powers of the state. Property is a creation of society and is a legal and social rather than an individual or natural thing. As to the origin of the property right Hobbes follows Pufendorf. In general the first possessor has valid claim to property. "And therefore those things that cannot be enjoyed in common nor divided ought to be adjudged to the first possessor; and in some cases to the first-born as acquired by lot."³

Hobbes did not make society rest upon property as did Rousseau, Mably, Thiers, and others. He saw property grow out of social organization and order, as

¹ Cf. Kautsky, "Vorläufer des neueren Socialismus," Stuttgart, 1895, p. 3.

² "Leviathan," Pt. I, Ch. 13.

³ *Op. cit.*, Pt. I, Ch. 15.

one of their results. Property is not, then, a natural right, and would not be found in a state of nature. To return to this state would rid man of the evils of property. Alike in the happy state of the hopeful socialist and the gloomy realm of the cynical Hobbes would be lacking the problem of civilization — private property.

These writers may be said to represent a class who were seriously attempting to explain and justify the right of property at a time when, with the breaking up of feudalism, the system was being shaken, just as others arose to defend monarchy when, with the rise of democracy, its foundations were made insecure. It has been seen that the right of private property had been defended on three grounds: the labor theory, the right of the first occupant, and the social utility theory.

Somewhat later there appeared in France a group of writers who equally as seriously questioned the right of private property. Of these there were two classes: those who saw in it evil and only evil and called for its abandonment, and those who condemned it, but who looked upon it as a social necessity, a necessary evil; just as they viewed government or conventional society at large.

10. Among the early writers who contemplated a social upheaval and opened a direct attack upon property perhaps the one of most interest was the

curate, Jean Meslier.¹ Meslier was an uncompromising foe of property and set forth in the clearest manner his belief in the common control of the wealth of society. Among the evils which oppressed mankind and called for reform the worst is private property.² Meslier attacked property chiefly on sentimental grounds. Property means, he says, inequality; inequality leads to injustice and oppression.³ The rich are respected and honored, while the poor must toil in neglect. Property he condemns as a cause of idleness; the idle rich class finds its complement in an idle poor class. This latter class is made up of the unemployed who, because of the present system, have nothing to do and are hence in

¹ Jean Meslier, or Mellier, was born in 1664. He was educated for orders, but gradually drifted into scepticism, and was the intellectual father and guide of Voltaire. From being sceptical as to certain tenets of the church he came to be a radical and aggressive materialist. From a religious critic he developed into a social iconoclast, and was as bitter against the existing social order as he was against the religious system. The chief source of his thought in this line was "Le Testament de Jean Meslier," a very rare book. There is an original copy in the National Library in Paris, from which these excerpts are made.

² "Un autre abus encore et qui est presque universellement reçu et autorisé dans le monde est l'appropriation particulière que les hommes se font des biens et des richesses de la terre au lieu qu'ils devraient tous également les posséder en commun et en jouir aussi également en commun." — "Le Testament," Ch. 49.

³ The close relationship of property rights to inequality he expresses, "l'appropriation particulière que les hommes se font des biens et des richesses de la terre," is the cause of all oppression. Quoted by Grünberg, "Revue d'Économie Politique," 1888, p. 291.

poverty. Cupidity and its attendants, ambition and greed, he points out as the evils in a society based upon property. Property does unite people; but through jealousy tends to break up social harmony, and hence destroys social unity.

Like later socialists Meslier traces crime back to the institution of private property. Fraud, deception, theft, and murder, he affirms, find their cause in property. Society might be happy were goods made common and equality secured. Meslier saw what so many overlooked, that the basis of equality is equality of economic condition. Other writers before and after the Revolution saw and affirmed that political equality was an empty phrase so long as such a chasm separates those who have from those who have not. On this point these earlier writers agree.

Drawing closer to the Revolution some attention is due the writer whose ideas had such an influence on all types of thought, Jean Jacques Rousseau. There has been much discussion recently concerning Rousseau's real teachings on questions of social organization. He has, on one hand, been called a communist, and an enemy of the then existing social order, and, on the other, a defender of private property and of social order. It seems safe to say that he was not a communist; neither was he a social iconoclast. Indeed, he advises few radical measures of any kind. In a very general man-

ner he condemned civilization and society at large, and thus it may be said he attacked the particular institution. In both his works, "Discours sur l'Inégalité" and his "Contrat Social," he recognizes the necessary connection between property and a stable condition of society, and that modern civilization rests largely upon the institution of private property.¹ If society must exist, then property must be tolerated as its basis and security. In a state of nature, according to Rousseau, there was no private property. Society and property came into existence together, and the two are complementary. This part of his theory appears in his oft-quoted phrase: "The first man who, having enclosed a piece of land, thought of saying 'This is mine,' and found a people simple enough to believe him, was the true founder of civil society."

There are some interesting points of contact between the ideas of Rousseau and the earlier theories. With Locke he taught that above the needs of the individual no further right could exist. The natural and legitimate limits are the needs of the possessor. "Every man has by nature a right to all that is necessary to him; . . . his position allotted, he ought to confine himself to it, and he has no further right to the undivided property."² The right of prior occupancy as either justification or explanation of the origin of property Rousseau held

¹ Baudrillart, *op. cit.*, p. 283. ² "Du Contrat Social," Book I, Ch. 9.

was void; as the right must be established before there could be property. The property right rests upon law, and is a contractual and not a natural right. Though merely a convention, it is of such importance that society cannot dispense with it. Property is the true foundation of civil society, and the true guarantee of the order of the citizen (engagement); for if the laws had no such sanction nothing would be easier than to evade duty and laugh at the laws.¹

Rousseau does, however, see evils in society and in the institution of private property in particular. These he attacks in no mild terms. "How many crimes, how many murders, how many wars, how many misfortunes and horrors would that man have saved the human race, who, pulling up the stakes and filling up the ditches, should have cried to his fellows: 'Be sure not to listen to this impostor; you are lost if you forget that the fruits of the earth belong equally to all, and the earth to nobody.'"² Rousseau admitted communism in theory, but he did not propose its application; he saw evils in the right of inheritance, but in view of the greater evil of very rapidly shifting fortunes he upheld the right of transmission. Rousseau was not a forerunner of the radical French school that produced the social side of the Revolution. His relations to the

¹ "A Discourse upon the Origin and Foundation of the Inequality among Mankind," p. 154.

² *Ibid.*, p. 97.

political aspects of the Revolution were no doubt more important, while in regard to the social side he was conservative, believing the existing institutions necessary to orderly society. He looked on property as one of the steps in the transition of man from the lower to a higher state. The abandonment of property would mean a reversion to barbarism.¹ He commends a return to a happy state of nature, but offers no definite substitute for the existing conditions.

¹ Sudre, "Histoire du Communisme, ou Réfutation historique des Utopies socialistes," Paris, 1850, p. 169.

CHAPTER VII

THE SOCIAL TEACHINGS OF MORELLY

1. As has been stated there is a noticeable advance in method from the time of Thomas More to that of Morelly. Work in the social field was affected by this change. Gradually the spirit of inductive study and the habit of more scientific investigation had worked its way into the mental processes of the thinkers and writers on these lines. By the time of Morelly and Montesquieu a large element of accuracy and detail appears in the social treatises. Especially was this true of Montesquieu and Condorcet. In "Spirit of Laws" the historical, inductive process is most evident, and the conclusions rest upon a large amount of scientific reasoning. This feature is less marked in Morelly and still less in Rousseau. The writings of Morelly, however, show a marked historical tendency and a clearer, more analytic method. He deals in historical evidence and enters into detail in both his destructive and constructive work. "Conjectural" this history may be; imperfect the analysis may appear; meagre though the scheme for a new social structure certainly seems, — yet in the writings of Morelly is shown a

clearer appreciation of what the social problems are and more matured plans for their solution.

In the first place Morelly so attempts to analyze society as to locate the causes of evil in the social environment and not in the nature of the individual — a very fundamental proposition. He considers society in its two aspects, — the collective whole and its individual members, its constituent elements. The philosophers had also done this. The nature of the individualistic teaching led to this view. The recognition of the individual as the "Unit of Empire" was one of the primary facts of the revolutionary thinking.¹ The marked advance in the method of Morelly lies in this: most writers of this time assumed a "man of nature," endowed with certain innate powers, qualities, and ideas;² and while he was supposed to possess certain inalienable rights which existed before government and persisted in spite of such government, few had seriously considered the reasonable doubt as to the qualities and place of this assumed natural man.³ No serious attempt had been made outside of the conjectures of romancists to trace this man of nature and this society based upon contract to see whether any such thing had existed or could in the nature of things exist.

¹ Kuno Francke, *A History of German Literature as determined by Social Forces*, 1903, p. 493.

² Instance Locke, "Human Understanding."

³ Rousseau, "Contrat Social," Part I, p. 1.

Satisfied with "glittering generalities," most writers paid little or no attention to the actual details of primitive society nor inquired how things had actually transpired.

To certain little known and underestimated writers much credit is due for introducing into social study a more analytic method and the tendency to more thoroughly investigate social origins. Among these Morelly¹ and Linguet² are the most conspicuous examples. Their method was more inductive, their investigation less telescopic. Morelly asked the critical question whether, if a new type of society were to replace the old, it was possible with this kind of primitive man to maintain a better condition of society. This question he was hopeful enough to answer in the affirmative. He was optimistic enough to believe the experiment promised success and the chances for better social conditions justified a social revolution. He thought it possible to abandon the existing system and so to reorganize society as to give the nobler elements the supremacy instead of the selfish, baser passions which ruled under present conditions.

Morelly, using the form of fiction, at first published a covert but bitter attack on existing society, and suggested in vague form a new social state free from the evils

¹ "Code de la Nature," 1755.

² "Théorie des Lois Civiles," Paris, 1767, 2 vols.

which marked his age.¹ His "Code de la Nature" made no pretence, however, to veil its true meaning either as to matter or purpose. It was a clear, definite statement of revolutionary doctrine in a very revolutionary age. It is in his teachings that the radical revolutionary philosophy in France took a definite meaning and added importance in the form of a constructive social scheme, much as the New Thought was given a practical revolutionary direction in Italy by the Calabrian monk. The "Code" appeared eight years after the "Spirit of Laws," and the year following the "Contrat Social." The first part is occupied with a defence of the main contentions of the "Basiliade"; the second and third books deal critically with the existing social state; while the last book outlines his constructive plan for a perfect commonwealth. It contains a set of definite rules whose introduction would so transform society as to lead to a happy social state.

2. In the preceding chapter the general drift of thought along those lines which touch socialistic theory has been briefly outlined. The more special application of these theories will be here pointed out as found in the works of Morelly.

One of the fundamental doctrines in the theory of Morelly was his denial of the dogma of innate ideas, fathered by John Locke, and holding sway for a century

¹ "Basiliade," 1751-1753.

previous. This attitude was of importance in its relation to the possibility of a radical social change, while it cleared the way for Morelly's doctrine of human goodness and his theory of environment. It is quite obvious that the attempt to defend private property by basing it upon an innate and common human instinct fails where any such notion is denied.

In denying the existence of such innate ideas, as Morelly did, he destroyed the argument that private property was consistent with the instincts and the nature of man; or that it had social utility in furnishing the so-called original and hence indestructible source of economic stimulus and motive.¹ If there be no innate sense or idea of property, then, when man has been reduced to his native simplicity and stripped of his social heritage, there is no ambition nor desire for property to perplex. If property is no more than an historical category, then it is merely an artificial institution, not original, not natural nor necessary, not eternal, and may well pass away in the process of historical development.

3. As has been said, the theory of a condition of primitive goodness and happiness is an old and popular one. It has long been set forth by writers, sacred and profane. Goodness and happiness have generally been

¹ "L'homme n'a ni idées ni penchants innés." — "Code," p. 52. Cf. Helvétius, where the ideas said to be innate are only those most familiar to us, the result of education, culture, and habit. "System of Nature," translation, p. 15.

linked together in the relation of cause and effect. From the biblical account, where, in a lost paradise, perfect goodness was coupled with perfect happiness, down to the period of the Revolution this idea found a great variety of supporters. Morelly partook of the same delightful optimism, that to make people good was possible, and that perfect happiness would certainly follow. He is not the only social reformer to follow this fond delusion.

As Rousseau and Montesquieu had done, Morelly took as his type the Indians of North America. In this choice he shows the use he made of the inductive method and seems to have had some facts as a basis for his theories. He had probably learned the parlance of the times from Mrs. Behn and Rousseau. He discussed the noble Indian as illustrative of a people living under primitive conditions, where happiness and goodness were synonymous. Against the gay but superficial society of eighteenth-century France, he set the humbler modes and simpler manners of primitive man marked by lofty virtues, much as Tacitus had done with the early Germans for the degenerate Romans.¹

This theory, as advanced by Morelly, bears the philosophical rather than the theological stamp. His work sounds more modern and up to date than that of earlier writers; it savors of a type of speculative, political, and

¹ Tacitus, "Germania."

social philosophy; his ideas are more legal and definite. With him goodness does not mean conformity to some divine law, but a certain obedience to the metaphysical concept of the "law of nature." His idea of the right to rule is the divine right of the people rather than the old divine theory of kingship.

With Morelly the "good man" is one who can be thoroughly socialized, whose individuality will be lost in the social whole. To him the "Fall of Man" means his departure from nature's law, and his social salvation can be effected only through his return to nature. This was his lord and father of all. This, then, is the basis of Morelly's proposed new society. He posits a "man of nature," who is the prototype of the true social unit. He is not the "economic man" of the economist's dream, marked by egoism and selfishness; he is the highly socialized man. He is not the warlike, natural man portrayed by Hobbes, nor the imperfect specimen of Locke; he is not the man of original sinfulness set forth by the theologian. Man, as Morelly saw him, was of good qualities, capable of perfectibility and fitted by the laws of his being to be more completely socialized. He so pictured the cardinal virtues of the primitive man as to indicate that society can be held together without force and can be dominated by the social elements. Morelly then denies the theory of innate ideas and of original sin.

He denies that man is essentially, inherently evil, and proclaims the brighter doctrine of native goodness. He teaches the doctrine of human perfectibility, and on these propositions bases his hopes of a regenerated society.

4. These philosophic principles, held by Morelly and his radical associates, though apparently very impractical, were at bottom sound premises on which to advance. The question put and answered by Morelly was this: Is the source of evil and wrong to be found in society as at present organized, or is it traceable to deeper causes in human nature itself? Has human nature the inherent qualities or the lack of certain qualities now dominant, that a new society may be constructed and social wrong, misery, and injustice be banished? The same question was asked as to the common man's fitness to take part in government, when democracy was young. A variety of answers might be found; nor is it yet entirely settled how far every person is endowed to become a part of the active political society. If the success of society, politically organized, depends so largely upon the possibilities of the individual citizen, the question is certainly ever timely when the chances of a socialistically organized industrial society are under discussion. If democracy fails, it fails because the common man is not properly endowed politically. Should socialism be tried and fail, it would

fail because man is not properly endowed socially and industrially.¹

Morelly was firmly attached to the environment theory of evil. In this he was followed by Robert Owen, whose whole system of reform was based upon the proposition that with proper social and industrial environment people will generally be good and do good.² Morelly claimed that evil arose from secondary and not from primary causes. As the cause of evil is not in man, the element of society, but in the maladjustment of social forces, it can therefore be eradicated, and society is not hopeless. Its hope lies in the destruction of those institutions whereby the social instincts are perverted into selfishness. Society must therefore be reduced to its original elements and reorganized according to the laws of nature.

For Morelly history meant little or nothing. It taught no lessons and told only of man's oppression by institutions of his own creation to which he had submitted. It was an abstract man of social instincts and of unchangeable qualities that formed the basis of the social theorizing of Morelly. It was the same general concept that was embodied in the "economic man." The same idea underlies the deductions

¹ On this see Schäffle, "The Impossibility of Social Democracy."

² Robert Owen, "New View of Society"; or essays on the formation of the human character, London, 1816.

of Adam Smith, Malthus, and Ricardo. It was this abstraction that was made use of by such advocates of perfectibility as Godwin, Helvétius, Shelley, and Jefferson. It was this idea of a constant social unit in a static state that had such influence in theory and practice until Hegel in philosophy, Savigny in law, Darwin in science, Knies and Hildebrand in economics, and Karl Marx in socialism taught the lesson of evolution in all lines, and banished the myths of "man of nature," "economic man," etc., into the limbo of forgotten things.

The early theories taught that man was inherently and normally bad; the later revolutionary doctrines treat him as a creature of infinite social and political possibilities if he can but be set free from thralldom to existing institutions. Of these the one treated as of prime importance was private property. This, then, is the starting-point for the destructive work of Morelly.

5. Private property, says Morelly, is a great mastering fact in society which determines the whole course of civilization; from it all evils flow, and its abandonment would solve all the social problems.¹

On the evils of the régime of property he says: "It

¹ "Depuis le sceptre jusqu'à la houlette, depuis la tiare jusqu'à le plus vil froc, si l'on demande qui gouverne les hommes, la réponse est facile; l'intérêt personnel ou un intérêt étranger que la vanité fait adopter, et qui est toujours tributaire du premier, mais de qui ces monstres tiennent-ils le jour? de la propriété." — "Code de la Nature," pp. 100-101.

is vain to search for a perfect state of liberty and social progress when a tyrant of private property continues to oppress mankind. It is vain to discuss the form of government; the means of establishing republics; all this is vain so long as private property subsists to break up social harmony and make mankind indolent, jealous, ambitious, and unsocial." Of all schemes, whether under aristocracy, monarchy, or democracy, Morelly says with much emphasis: "Quel frères supports, Grand Dieu! tous portent plus ou moins sur la propriété et l'intérêt les plus ruineux de tous les fondements." ¹ He taught that the leading feature in the present civilization was private property; and its unhappy outgrowths were the legion of evils which curse society.

Right here he grasped an idea which later socialism has taught. Changes in the form of government are superficial so long as society is economically unbalanced. Property keeps society ever in a state of uncertain equilibrium. Why, he asks, should social welfare and stability be constantly menaced by that thing best fitted and inclined to destroy them; namely, property? Such has been the evil that has overthrown the most flourishing empires while nothing has done more to stir the savage spirit of revolution than has property. With some such statements, often repeated, Morelly

¹ "Code de la Nature," p. 102.

condemns property as the root of social evils and misery.

Communism in property, as advocated by Morelly, and in fact by most of its adherents, does not mean the abandonment of the idea of ownership of property nor of saving and acquisition. It does not imply the rejection of these, any more than does the acceptance of democracy in place of monarchy mean to abandon sovereignty and abrogate control and government.

Communism would transfer the control of property from the individuals to the community, conceived of as a unity. Democracy involves the transfer of sovereignty from a monarch to the separate individuals, upon a decidedly individualistic basis. Communism seeks the socialization of the rights of property. Democracy means the decentralization of the rights of sovereignty. It is in this respect that all socialism, of a radical type, conflicts with individualism. It strikes at the main factor in the development of man's place and power in society; that is, his control over property. It could be easily shown that the history of the evolution of property and of the property idea in the social classes would fairly synchronize with the growth of liberty and of individualism from slavery through serfdom up to the free laborer and to the freer capitalist employer.

Furthermore, communism, as here taught, does not contemplate the equal division of goods; it does not

propose to divide them at all. It means the concentration of all goods in the hands of the communal group. The distribution of surplus-values flowing from the industrial process must find another basis than the one where society rests on private ownership of the social wealth. Here the right to the shares of surplus-value rests upon, and is to some extent at least proportionate to, the control over the factors of production. The fact of private ownership has for ages been the rather simple and, under the existing régime, fairly equitable principle for the distribution of the social income. Ownership of wife or of slave, of serf or of land, and later of capital has been at least a working principle for distribution. With the abandonment of private property, however, some new norm must be discovered and applied. Several have been advanced. That all share alike, is the simplest one and, ignoring equity, would be workable. That each share according to his wants is another, more equitable but less practical. The theory of Morelly is discussed under his constructive scheme.

As to the social utility of the proposed system Morelly had no doubt; not only did he deny the natural rights justification of property, but he rejected the theory then so prevalent, that property was socially necessary. Over this question Mably and Mercier had debated, the latter claiming that property was an essential

part of the social organization; this Mably denied. In England Harrington had first urged the vital relationship between property and social stability;¹ while in France it became a tenet of the physiocratic school. Rousseau had conceded much to this view, and Mably saw much reason in it. Morelly was, therefore, one of the most radical of this group and paved the way for those more extreme revolutionary theorists, Brissot and Babeuf.² In this respect Morelly was a thorough-going socialist as the term is interpreted in this essay. He was not a reformer nor philanthropist; he had no confidence in reforming the existing society; he demanded a new structure.

6. One of the problems which all types of reformers, moral, political, and social, must face, is to supply the proper motive to efficient and worthy action. One of the fundamental objections urged against socialism since the days of Plato is that it would rob society of its underlying and propelling motive. It is claimed that there is danger of creating a nerveless society; that to interfere with private property, with individual initiative, and with the personal control over one's economic course, would limit production, check progress, and work a general wreck of industrial prosperity.

To this difficulty Morelly seriously addressed himself. He admitted that there is a strong economic motive

¹ Harrington, "Oceana."

² See Ch. VIII., *infra*.

taken away when private property and the incentive to saving are abandoned. He denied, however, that idleness would make shipwreck of society thus organized. The great mass of idleness he saw about him he attributed to the facts of property and the right of inheritance.¹ Do away with these and he believed that the idle class, and idleness in all classes, would disappear. Here he saw a compensation for any loss of incentive to labor. Industry would become a necessity for all, and the army of the employed would be much enlarged. Morelly's "economic man" was prompted by vastly different motives from those driving on the economic man in the pecuniary age. He would be induced to labor by economic motives as all peoples have been, even the American Indians, whom he uses as examples. There is, however, a vast difference in the economy of the primitive man and that of the modern economic man. One has the motives arising from a desire for profits, for acquisition, for property; the other toils only for the necessary and useful things; one is interested in exchange, the other in use, values.

Moreover, Morelly points out a second fact, and in this he foreshadows modern theories. It is not *labor* that men avoid, it is the unpleasantness of it. Once make labor attractive, make idleness repulsive, wear-

¹ "Code de la Nature," p. 61.

some, and unpopular, and the problem is solved.¹ In the future state as depicted by Morelly, as in that of the fair dreams of Fourier, labor was to be enjoyable and pain and ennui would arise from idleness. In this respect Morelly was a direct forerunner of Fourier.²

There was, furthermore, a broader principle involved in the theory of Morelly. His scheme of socialization involved the bringing into private life a larger public purpose as regards industrial effort. In the social state of the future, men are to feel themselves a part of the state from an industrial, as they do now from a civil, standpoint.³ The same energy, unselfishness, and devotion which mark the citizen's performance of civic duty would characterize the economic activity of the citizens of this new social state.

7. Approaching more closely to the details of Morelly's scheme, some interesting suggestions appear. There was no private ownership of productive goods; only those things for immediate use could be held privately.⁴ There was to be public control of industry and every person was to become a public servant. "Tout citoyen sera homme public, sustenté, entretenu, et occupé aux dépens du public."⁵ The industrial schemes of

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 45-58.

² "Basiliade," p. 28.

³ Popularly urged to-day as a means whereby civic interest might be awakened.

⁴ "Code de la Nature," p. 152.

⁵ *Ibid.*

Morelly foreshadow the later French collectivism.¹ In his ideal society much attention is paid to the creation of primary utilities of which agricultural products have the preference. Morelly showed marked physiocratic tendencies. Each city was to maintain as large a piece of land as was necessary for the inhabitants. Every citizen after his twentieth year was compelled to work at agriculture for five years. One chapter of the "Code" is devoted to a discussion of the means and ends of agriculture.

The plan of industrial organization set forth is in the form of local collectivism; it was paternal, somewhat after the manner of a mediæval craft-guild. Members of the professions were divided into groups of ten or twenty laborers and placed under a master. These groups were close corporations, admission being gained by long apprenticeship directed to giving great proficiency in the trade.

8. Every one must labor in this society. There were to be no drones in this social hive. There was no provision for a leisure class either at the top or bottom of the social scale. Every man was born into the industrial state, as in the Middle Ages every one was born into the church, or by modern polity every one is born into the civil state. All must, therefore, prepare for

¹ Cf. plans of Vidal and Pecqueur outlined in their works already cited.

a place in industrial society, a fact applied to-day from a civil standpoint in the systems of compulsory education. The industries were open except where groups were overcrowded; in such cases the magistrates performed the task now allotted to free competition; that is, to equalize the labor supply.¹ After the citizens had spent the proper time at agriculture they were allowed to enter the various trades — a decided protest against the guild system then dominant in France against which Turgot directed one of his six edicts.

The length of the labor day is left less definite by Morelly than by the other writers examined. The masters of the various trades were to fix the length of day. The days of rest were, however, fixed. Each fifteenth day was to be a public holiday. It will be recalled that the Revolutionary Assembly of 1793 made every tenth day a holiday.

9. Morelly did not overlook the fact that the kern of the social problem is, and always has been, the problem of the distribution of the product of industry among the producers in the régime of private, but among the consumers under a system of communistic, industry. In every scheme of social organization the greatest difficulty lies here, and communism has by no means solved it even theoretically, to say nothing of what might come in practice. While it is not stated clearly, the

¹ "Code de la Nature," p. 160.

theory of Morelly seems to be that "each is to labor according to his ability and share according to his needs."¹ (Scheme of Saint-Simon.)

Morelly divides wealth into "natural goods" and "artificial goods." These he classifies as durable and transient. From a standpoint of value they are either necessities or luxuries. Goods for general use were to be stored in magazines for regular distribution among the people. This is, of course, a distribution of goods and not of values. Productive goods were also stored and given out to the ateliers as the workmen had need.² Goods were measured and distributed quantitatively, no attention being paid to the problem of values. The plan was to apportion goods according to the primary needs of the people.³

Morelly conceived of a society in which no exchange of values took place; or if any, it was of the simplest form of service against consumable goods. No goods were to be sold and no mercantile profits were allowed. In this regard, Morelly shows his connection with modern socialism. "Profits" have ever been objectionable to radical thinkers of this type. While no exact statement is made of "surplus-value," of "unearned increment," or of "exploitation of labor," yet in

¹ "Code," pp. 153 and 154.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 153-155.

³ "Ces productions de toute espèce seront dénombrées et leur quantité sera proportionnée, soit au nombre des citoyens de chaque cité, soit au nombre des citoyens qui en usent." — "Code," p. 154.

essence this is what Morelly protests against. What he says on this point is not great in amount ; it is not very clear in form ; it does, however, contain the germ of the most important contention of all socialism. Stripped of its scientific nomenclature, freed from much of its verbiage, separated from the sophistry and dialectic used as a safe statement of dangerous doctrine — rid of all these, the tenets of socialism are after all simple. They may be reduced to about two principles: that sacrifice must rest upon physical effort and that all should sacrifice alike.

Epigrammatically put, socialism means, there shall be no idle class. It means a reduction of modern, complex society to a state of primitive society; a condition where all must labor and labor alike. It is probably not so much the luxuries of the propertied class that create socialist sentiment, as the so-called idleness. Hence the bitter attack of all socialism on that form of social and industrial organization under which a certain portion of society can live without laboring. Here then is the chief fact in the work of Morelly: society must be so constructed that all sources of income are rejected except labor. Labor being possessed by all men, a condition of lasting equality will be produced.

In sharp contrast to the mercantile theory just passing in Europe, which had so long held to the pecun-

iary advantages of foreign commerce, Morelly held that foreign commerce should exist merely to supply necessary commodities for consumption, which the respective countries could not well produce. All was to be so arranged that profits, and specially those expressed in money, should not accrue.

10. The leading feature of Morelly's scheme of political organization is his adherence to the natural rights doctrine. He advises a form of political society which he calls democracy, although it bears the earmarks of a patriarchal form of state. He defines a democracy as a society where the people consent to obey the laws of nature and live under the command of the father of the families.¹ Monarchy, he says, is the most dangerous and least stable form of government, especially when based on private property; with this institution abolished, monarchy would be fairly stable.²

Morelly taught that the early form of society and government was patriarchal. Among the several causes which led to its breakup were the increase of population, migration, and the accompanying growth of private property. Community of feeling and of interests arising from consanguinity form the original basis of social unity. The increase of population broke up

¹ He has the idea of "tacit consent" and of the "volonté générale" of Rousseau.

² "Code," p. 105.

the consanguine groups; it also made migration necessary, and the meeting of strange groups still further estranged the members of society. This led to the destruction of society based upon the social principle of mutual interests and created a society where conflict and not mutuality of interests was the rule. The spirit of antagonism embodied and perpetuated itself in the institution of private property. When this has been thoroughly developed, society, in Morelly's meaning, ceases, and the long struggle of classes and their interests begins. This is not true society; it arises from a perversion of the social instincts, and true socialization can only be effected by the abandonment of private property and the reestablishment of mutual interests.¹ He believed that primitive society had communal property, that the bonds of consanguinity were the earliest social ties, that private property and its associated brood of wrongs have their effects in the chaos in society and in the loss of primitive social harmony.

Morelly directly attacked the ruling forces in France. The monarch, he said, was on a very unstable throne. The religious and civil powers had united to perpetuate

¹ "La raison, dis je, de tous ces effets peut se tirer de l'obstination générale des législateurs à rompre ou laisser rompre le premier lien de toute sociabilité par des possessions usurpées sur le fonds qui devait indivisiblement appartenir à l'humanité entière." — "Code," p. 87.

their power.¹ Their supreme power was, however, more seeming than real. On the eve of that Revolution which, as Carlyle says, did so much to reduce "chimeras to realities," these teachings of Morelly seem prophetic. In view of the struggle so soon to be waged, these charges of tyranny and misrule were as timely as they were bold and outspoken. In his brief but clear arraignment of the social and political institutions with their hollowness and mockery, one sees a severe criticism not unlike the more subtle attack of Sir Thomas More on the English society of his day.

Morelly accepts the contract theory of society. Thus organized rulers are viewed only as the servants of the people and rule only by their consent. The imprescriptible rights of the people hold as against the will of the rulers.² The senate was to keep exact account of the number of persons in each tribe and also the demand for employment in each. It had power in the most arbitrary fashion to equalize population groups. He advised the regulation of the increase of the population so as to keep the birthrate and deathrate alike. This sums up what he had to say on the problem of population. A complete set of rules is laid down for the regulation of the family group whose sphere the

¹ "Ces exemples prouvent donc que dans le monde moral construit comme il est par des mains mortelles, il n'y a ni véritable subordination ni véritable liberté." — "Code," p. 100.

² *Ibid.*, p. 109.

public power was supposed to invade at will. His teachings on family life, however, were wholesome and conservative. To him the destruction of private property did not necessitate the ruin of the family. To most such advocates the two institutions stand or fall together.¹

II. The educational plans of Morelly have been about as much neglected as have his social ideas; yet he was, if not the originator, then the inspirer of much that Rousseau taught. It is not possible here to trace these ideas at length, nor to establish the debt Rousseau owes him in connection with his "Émile." Certain it is that their lines of thought were very similar.

Morelly advocated a natural system of education. The necessary relationship between the stages of mental development and the matter studied, he carefully regarded. The various subjects are added only as the reason is developed to appreciate them.² He also carefully pointed out the public purpose of education and its relation to the welfare of the state. Very early the child was to be taught the laws of the state and to respect established authority.³ The youths were cultured in those lines at once fitted to further the individual interests and the common welfare. Education

¹ Cf. Engels, "Ursprung der Familie, des Privat eigenthums und des Staats," 1892, where the family is made the foundation of the institution of property.

² "Code," pp. 170.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 171-172.

must also serve to eradicate certain dangerous social ideas — among them the desire for private property. In his society there was to be complete freedom of thought and toleration in religion, only writings touching morals or the public welfare were to be censored.¹

The clearest suggestions as to the need and nature of the technical schools, now so widely established in France, are to be found in the writings of Morelly. He laid emphasis on the importance of training in the industrial arts, and as all must labor in his society, none were exempt from this technical training. His plan suggests the English apprentice-laws.

As has been said, all the parts of Morelly's scheme were highly artificial. So with his educational plans. The purpose of education was the common welfare. When all over Europe there was education for the upper classes alone, he advocated a universal system. When the educational system was a revenue-producing institution, Morelly proposed not only free but compulsory education. While learning was still advancing along the narrow lines of the classics, bearing the marks of mediæval culture, Morelly proposed the founding of industrial and technical schools to better prepare the masses for practical life. His educational ideas were far advanced and he must be credited with very sane

¹ "Code," pp. 172-173.

notions in this line as shown by such other radicals as Rousseau, Owens, and Fourier.

12. In striking contrast with some of the rising doctrines of his age stand the ideas and teachings of Morelly. Helvétius, in his now almost forgotten work, "Essays on the Human Mind," had taught that self-interest was the dominant motive in life. Adam Smith, leaving aside his "Theory of Moral Sentiments" marked by the lesson of altruism, took up the other side of life — its extreme selfishness — and constructed one of the most useful but satirical myths, the "Economic Man." Legislators and philosophers were discussing whether the public and private interests could be reconciled. During this time Morelly had urged that man's highest happiness is reached as he works in the interests of the social aggregate, and as a servant of all. He taught that public interest and private welfare are one and the same thing, and attainable through the establishment of a community of interests.

Out of the prevailing sensationalist philosophy naturally came an extreme individualistic tendency in social teaching; where sensation is made the basis of all knowledge, and the happiness experienced the highest test of good, individual pleasure is sure to become the touchstone of right social action and selfishness the dominant creed of life. The utility theory of value, the pleasure and pain doctrine of morals, and the

state of nature theory of rights — all these, are inseparable from an individualistic view of man and his social relations. Whether consistent or not, Morelly protests against these desocializing ideas. Morelly sees the happiness and welfare of the whole state the thing to be sought for as Plato had taught so long before; happiness dwells neither in this class nor in that, but in the state as a whole.¹ In the prevailing English thought, marked by extreme individualism, social welfare was hoped for as the individual followed his own selfish ends; in the teaching of Morelly social welfare was expected as man became absorbed and incorporated in the state.²

The dominant motive in the society portrayed by Morelly arises from the social instincts. In fact his study of what might be called an enlightened self-love led him to make a most valuable contribution to social thought. In his discussion of the human passions he has anticipated the work of Fourier in the theory of the "attraction passionelle." Morelly considered none of the human passions as wrong nor harmful; all were to be developed and in this way a more perfect socialization could be attained. It is this type of socialized egoism that Morelly believes will lead to the highest

¹ "Republic," Jowett's translation, pp. 107-108.

² Dowden, "The French Revolution and English Literature," p. 7.

social action.¹ Morelly here reaches a conclusion made so much of later by Fourier. Both held that, as in the physical world, one dominant force rules; so in the moral world there is one controlling power. With Morelly it is enlightened self-love; with Fourier it is the "attraction passionelle."

¹ "L'amour de nous mêmes est ce mobile général qui nous pousse vers le bien; et les passions dont il est la source prennent leurs noms des degrés de force qui nous en approchent ou nous en éloignent."
— "L'Essai sur le cœur humain," London, 1746.

CHAPTER VIII

THE REVOLUTIONARY RADICALS

1. There had been then, previous to the Revolution, a certain recognition of social as well as of political wrongs and inequalities. The protest against these conditions was not made directly against any class, nor was it taken up by any distinct order of society. There was no capitalist class nor any proletariat class.¹ This very indefinite protest, this rather vague, anti-social teaching, ended with the Revolution, when a definite attack was made on existing institutions and a class-struggle began. At this time the labor-class or the *proletaire*, as the French came to call the propertyless class, began a struggle for recognition and a place in society. As Buonarroti says: "Besides, it was the general conviction that the zeal of the Proletarians, the only true supporters of equality, would redouble when they saw executed, from the very outset of the insurrection, those engagements, so many times postponed, by which their hard lot was to be ameliorated; and the

¹ Jaurès, "Histoire Socialiste" (sous la Direction de Jean Jaurès), Vol. I, p. 4.

secret Directory felt the greater confidence in the forces from the circumstance that its agents, while describing the people's impatience, boldly demanded of it the signal of battle."¹

Without either going into a study of those radical measures, suggested in France by the countless cahiers with which the Assembly was flooded, or into the laws actually proposed or passed in that body, — a task very well done by a recent writer, — notice will be called to a few of the radical utterances of the most radical advocates of social innovation in France on the eve of and during the period of the Great Revolution.² These writers bring to a close that radical aspect of socialism which hoped to reach social justice and betterment through a wholesale destruction of the existing order in so far as it was based upon private property.

The radicalism of the French Revolution was communistic only in a limited sense. An attack was made not against property in general, but only against certain phases of it. It was against the abuse rather than the use of the institution that protest was made and action was taken.³ Property rights resting upon the old feudal régime, and those in the possession of the clergy, were

¹ "History of Babeuf's Conspiracy," English translation, 1836, p. 139; cf. Jaurès, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 5 *et seq.*

² Lichtenberger, "Le Socialisme et la Révolution française," Paris, 1899.

³ Cf. Jaurès, "Études Socialistes," Paris, 1902, p. 91.

revolutionized.¹ No doubt the exemptions enjoyed by the upper classes, which freed them from the burdens incident to property, had accentuated the hatred toward the institution.

The final effect of the agitation on the stability of property was greatly to strengthen its foundations by more thoroughly distributing it, by revising the laws of inheritance, and by shifting the right of ownership from the old basis of feudal to the new basis of positive law; and that passed, presumably at least, by the will of a democratic society.² At this time the law was passed, which is still valid in France, compelling equal division of property among all heirs.³ There was a twofold movement; a confiscation of land on the part of the state, in the form of those estates which rested upon feudal rights, and then the decentralizing of these holdings through the breaking up of those estates and their division among a broad constituency. By thus creating a large middle-class of small property-holders a greater stability was given to all social institutions. The principle of private property was

¹ Janet, "Les origines du socialisme contemporain," Paris, 1883, p. 6.

² Lichtenberger, "Le Socialisme et la Révolution française," pp. 61 *et seq.*

³ See Law of 1793 on property and inheritance.

Cf. Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 65; Jaurès, "Histoire Socialiste," Vol. I, pp. 226 *et seq.*

then given a large and an interested constituency of property-holders.

Although there was during the Revolution a strong tendency, widespread and active, to resist the demoralizing influences of anarchy and communism, there was also a considerable tendency toward revolutionary socialism following the lead of Morelly and Mably. "The principle, once recognized, that the right of regulating for the general good, the distribution of wealth and of the labor that produces it, belongs to society; and that from inequality of distribution flow as from an inexhaustible source all the calamities that afflict nations; it follows that Society should provide that this inequality be destroyed never to return."¹ Such a principle may not have been universally or even generally recognized; it had certainly been strongly suggested before the Revolution, and radical leaders and writers did all in their power, during the great movement, to have this ideal realized.² It actually issued in a very great expansion of the public power into the sphere of the individual and the assumption by the state of very extended control. Did space permit, very ample illustrations of this condition could be given; as

¹ Buonarroti, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

See, Speeches of Mallet du Pan, "Tracts"; also, "History of the Brissotins" by Desmoulins, London, 1794.

² Cf. Barnave, "Introduction à la Révolution française," 1791, Buonarroti, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

in the law of 1793 settling property or the attempt of the legislature to fix wages and prices, and the decree of the insurrectionary committee involving a minute supervision by the government of all the industrial processes.¹

2. In general, it may be said that the social theories advanced during the Revolution are more definite and concise. They sound more modern. There is more of the class-color about them. They arise from a distinct consciousness of class-differences and of the hardship of the unpropertied class. Instead of the earlier demand for subsistence for all, they now demand a right to labor. Laborers claim the right to earn their living and resent the disgrace of becoming public wards. Here is a statement coming from this period and the clearest yet made of socialist doctrine. "Labor is for every one an essential condition of the social compact."

The general condemnation of private control and of the method of distribution on that basis shows the same attitude seen in the writings of Morelly. "The unequal distribution of goods and of labor is the inexhaustible source of slavery and of all public calamities."² In the decrees may be found statements illustrating the existing attitude toward ownership. "That the pro-

¹ "The Convention has adopted this idea by decreeing that all citizens who give up a day's labor to the important duties of political debates in their section, shall receive 40 sous a day to be paid by a tax on the rich." — Speech of Brissot, "Tracts," p. 60.

² Buonarroti, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

prietorship of all the riches of France resides essentially in the French people, which can alone determine the repartition of them.”¹

The scheme set forth in this decree was decidedly of the utopian type. It contained a plan whereby France was to establish a new social order. The past was to be ignored and abandoned, and a new social system was to issue. The purpose was revealed by the opening clause, “The people of Paris after having overthrown tyranny, using the right which it has received from nature, acknowledges and declares to the French people,” etc. In theory the radical statesmen adhered to the law of nature; they denied, however, that property was a natural right and proceeded to transfer it to a basis of positive law and make of it a civil right.

3. Considerable effort has been put forth recently to show that there were no considerable liberal or socialistic tendencies in the thought of the Revolution. Two eminent scholars and competent critics have taken the attitude that the French revolutionary movement was rather reactionary than radical, as touching those main lines of teaching along which socialism moves. Grünberg says that the influence of the socialist element in the Revolution was very slight;² that most of the revolutionary conventions were not what to-day would be

¹ Decree of 1793.

² Grünberg, “*Revue d'Économie Politique*,” 1891, p. 274.

called even liberal. Lichtenberger has questioned if there was any large element of socialist sentiment active in France.¹

It will probably be conceded, however, that the Revolution was marked, if not much influenced, by a group of very bold, able, and radical men who were attached to the propaganda of equality, communism, and radical social action in general.² Only the most uncertain speculation can be indulged in as to the influence they had on that revolutionary storm in the midst of which they found themselves. In conclusion, then, a brief review will be made of the leading ideas of that radical group whose works mark the close of this period of social theorizing.

4. Of this group the one of whom least is known, yet whose mode of attack is most similar to that of Morelly, is Boissel.³ His attack on existing society was most radical and comprehensive. He attacked the church for the idleness and hypocrisy of its clergy; the government for the deception and despotism of its rule; re-

¹ Lichtenberger, "Le Socialisme et la Révolution française," pp. 56-57.

² ". . . Mais le parasitisme de la propriété oisive qui ne laisse au métayer accablé que la moitié des fruits y est dénoncé aussi." — Jaurès, "Histoire Socialiste," Vol. I, p. 226.

³ Very little literature is available relating to this obscure writer. Consult, F. Boissel, "Le Catéchisme du genre humain," 1792; also article, Grünberg, "François Boissel," "Revue d'Économie Politique," 1891, pp. 273-286, 356-383.

ligion for its uselessness and its preposterous claims to supernatural origin, and the institutions of property and the family as being enemies of equality, liberty, and human welfare in general.

Boissel is one of the first writers¹ to recognize and call attention to the class-struggle in the modern meaning of the term. Earlier writers had, to be sure, seen the dividing line between rich and poor, and given two general classes based upon their economic conditions; these lines of cleavage were too obvious to escape attention. The emphasis, however, so far laid upon any distinct economic class was very slight. Boissel gives clear evidence of this growing class-consciousness in his response to Robespierre in the Tribunal in 1793. "Robespierre, you read yesterday the 'Declaration of the Rights' of man; but I come to read the declaration of the rights of the Sans-Culottes. The Sans-Culottes of the French Republic recognize that all their rights come from nature, and anything contrary to these are not

¹ Boissel was born in 1728. Raised as a Jesuit, he was educated for the church, was later admitted to the bar, and was elected to the Parlement of Paris in 1753. At the age of sixty he entered with vigor into the Revolution. He joined the Jacobin party and became a radical of the extreme type. He was specially active in defence of the Jacobins against the aristocratic party. Some speeches and letters remain, but his chief work is "Catéchisme du genre humain."

See the Speech by Desmoulins, 1794, "Tracts." Here he briefly traces the slow rise of the lower-class to a consciousness of its existence.

binding. The rights of the Sans-Culottes consist in the faculty to reproduce, feed, and clothe themselves; in the enjoyment of the fruit of the earth, our common mother.”¹

5. Boissel attacks property on the grounds of the natural rights argument. Every man has a natural right to existence. Any institution that prevents his enjoyment of this natural right is injurious and pernicious. Property does thus interfere with the exercise of this right by those who have no property, denies them a right to existence, and hence contradicts natural law. It violates the natural right of the individual to his existence. Boissel held, as did Morelly, that property was the cause of all the evils which curse mankind. “Everywhere it gives rise to slavery and dependence of men among themselves.”²

Boissel considers property as merely an historical category, a result of false historical development. It varies much in its content from age to age. It earlier had a much broader scope, including men, rivers, and seas. The tendency is for property to grow ever narrower in its reach. All property originated out of natural avidity, egoism, and all types of crime that are common to the natural constitution.³ Religion, prop-

¹ Quoted by Grünberg, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, p. 284.

² Grünberg, *op. cit.*, p. 364.

³ “Le Catéchisme du genre humain,” p. 25.

erty, and the family, he holds, were created by man to serve supposedly the highest social ends.

The final test, then, of these institutions is their social utility. When any such institution ceases to be a social benefit, it should be abandoned.¹ Any conclusion as to the nature of property and its service to society must be based upon experience alone. Experience shows that these institutions, especially private property, have been productive only of social evil. It is mathematically demonstrated, says Boissel, by the light of the experience of all the centuries, that the division of property and of land and the ownership of women have divided and impoverished the individuals and set one against another, and the laws are only citadels to keep the poor in subjection.² All are born with like needs, and the earth should be a table from which all should partake.³

Not only is property an evil in itself, but in the process of its acquisition social harmony is destroyed. It originated through egoism, insatiable desire, violence, and deception.⁴

Boissel opposes ownership in land on two grounds: because land in a particular manner is a free gift of nature, and also because land-ownership leads to a special type of social and political usurpation through

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

² "Le Code Civil de la France ou le Flambeau de la Liberté," p. 9.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁴ "Le Catéchisme," pp. 92-93.

the noble class.¹ His general protest, however, is against the system of property as being against the law of nature. It is, he says, a monstrosity.² Instead of furthering human progress it has checked and destroyed it. Nature knows no property rights. In civilization, through the struggle for property, the good qualities of man are perverted.³

6. As has been said, the denial of the old canons of distribution requires that new ones be set up. On this subject Boissel said very little, but this little is of a considerable interest. He has stated quite clearly a theory much used by later socialism; namely, that each should share according to his needs.⁴

7. In his treatment of the real worth of culture and society at large, Boissel clearly shows the influence of Rousseau. The latter viewed private property as a main pillar in the social structure and overlooked its evils in view of the larger evil of civilization itself; so Boissel, while condemning property, had a still greater contempt for the social system with all its sham, imposture, and fraud.⁵ Society itself, based as it is upon

¹ "Le Catéchisme," p. 93. ² *Ibid.*, p. 94. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

⁴ "Je l'appelle antisocial, parcequ'il engendre l'intérêt désastreux de ne rapporter qu'à soi, ce qui ne doit être rapporté qu'à la masse générale de la société, pour être distribué selon les besoins de ses membres; ce qui rompt tous les liens et détruit l'essence ou les principes constitutifs de contrat social." — *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

those institutions he condemns, is antisocial, mercenary, and homicidal. It is antisocial because the members of society and the social classes are placed in such sharp contrast to each other that true social life is impossible. It is homicidal because it arms the child against the parent and the brother against the brother. It is mercenary because the whole social process is carried on for a pecuniary purpose and none serves the other unless he expects a large recompense.² Society, as at present organized, marked by these mercenary motives, is antisocial and results in a false distribution of social benefits. This form he calls "Société léonine"; that is, a society where one class lives by devouring another class. For society, property, the family, religion, and law, Boissel has about equal contempt. All have been organized to lend legitimacy to the usurpations of the strongest.

He vigorously attacks the reasoning and conclusions of both Rousseau and Montesquieu. They presented mere palliatives instead of attacking and removing social wrongs. To Boissel these writers were but timid conservatives, constantly harping on the origin of evil, at the dawn of culture, but too cautious to offer any remedy.¹ This seems an interesting bit of con-

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 88 *et seq.*

² "Il n'a ouvert les yeux que sur l'origine du mal sans s'occuper d'aucun remède curatif; car son contrat social ne présente que les palliatifs contre le vice radical des sociétés humaines." — *Ibid.*, p. 98.

temporary opinion on men usually in this day called radicals.

Boissel was equally as radical in his attitude toward the family. He combined the two institutions — family and property — as one social wrong. In itself marriage is not an evil. It is because it helps to enlarge and perpetuate private property that it falls under the ban. The family, paternity, and the hereditary principle — these lead to the perpetuity in property.¹

Boissel seems to have no idea of the socializing force of the process of industry and the division of labor. All these activities, he seems to think, bring only warfare to society.² His plan for social reorganization provided for a return to the conditions of primitive life when all the difficulties of this complex society would vanish, and simple but helpful association would prevail.³

8. Boissel held many ideas in common with Morelly. His attitude toward existing institutions was, however,

¹ "La voilà, cette réponse de l'homme vraiment social, indicative du véritable ordre moral ainsi que des principes de l'éducation sociale, qui auraient dû et devraient encore aujourd'hui servir de base et de fondement à la civilisation de toutes les sociétés humaines, d'où résulteraient les plus grands biens à la place des plus grands maux." — "Le Catéchisme," p. 99.

² "C'est que par le partage des terres les hommes n'ont fait que se diviser pour vivre chacun de son travail; et que dans cette position, ils se sont armés et détruits les uns par les autres." — *Ibid.*, p. 100.

³ "Revue d'Économie Politique," 1891, p. 365.

more severe, and his attacks were more direct and bitter; being nearer the Revolution, his ideas gathered force from the surrounding storm. He had the same destructive purpose and would follow it with the same relentless directness. Like Morelly, he called attention to the need of constructive effort. He also drew up a "Code" for a reorganized France. He also was a constitution-maker. His "Code Civique" is patterned after the "Code" of Morelly, though it is less extensive.¹ In it may be read the same signs of hopefulness in the ability of the people to overturn the existing structure and to establish one better suited to their social needs. It was published when constitution-making was becoming a business in France, and contained many interesting political and social suggestions.

With Boissel as with the other early writers there is an absence of such clear discussion of the productive process as socialists have done later. The influences which largely shaped his thought arose from agrarian France.

9. The revolutionary agitator Babeuf has received somewhat more attention than the other writers here treated. The chief authority on his life and teachings is his compatriot Buonarroti, who, escaping execution for banishment in 1796 when Babeuf was beheaded,

¹ "Code Civique de la France," 1790. Copies of this are rare, one being in the National Library, Paris.

promised him he would write his biography. Accordingly this rather remarkable life of Babeuf was edited by Buonarroti in 1828. The most important documents left by Babeuf resulted from his work as a journalist. After the organization of the "Société du Panthéon," sometimes known as "Société des Égaux" an organ of communication was decreed necessary. This means Babeuf supplied in the *Tribune du Peuple*. In this journal he set forth his most radical views on society and the means for its reorganization. In it he entered his protest against existing social institutions. The ideas advanced in the *Tribune* were, on the whole, sanctioned by the "Société" and may be taken as the revolutionary programme of Babeuf and that radical group, who, as one of their number expressed it, believed that a mere change in the form of government was not sufficient; but that the social conditions must be changed and founded upon justice and virtue. They were in the midst of the revolutionary conflict, aiming to direct the French people toward perfect equality.¹

According to Babeuf and his associates, social organization is based upon a mutual compact. Each member entering this compact was equal with every other. In this primitive society there was absolute equality of wealth and of individual opportunity. All

¹ Buonarroti, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

material goods were in this period divided equally among all members of the group.¹ In this theory society exists to prevent inequalities; under existing conditions it rests upon inequalities.²

— To Babeuf the ideal of social organization demanded community of goods and of station.³ Into the hands of the public power should be committed the task of maintaining this condition of equality; this, they advised, should be done in France through the legislature.⁴ The club agreed that any condition was intolerable where this equality did not exist and where industry was not open to all.⁵ The Société du Panthéon, which had accepted the radical views of Babeuf, considered private property the enemy of justice and order in France, and hoped to see disorder, misrule, and idleness destroyed when communism became dominant.⁶

¹ Brissot de Warville, "Life of Brissot," p. 59.

² Buonarroti, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-87.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁴ "Détruire cette inégalité est donc la tâche d'un législateur vertueux; voilà le principe qui résulte de la méditation du comité; comment parvenir?" — *Ibid.*, p. 85.

⁵ "Et l'amener à proclamer que tous les hommes ont un droit égal aux productions de la terre et de l'industrie." — *Ibid.*, p. 85. Cf. Jaurès, "Histoire Socialiste," Vol. I, p. 4.

⁶ "Quant à la cause de ces désordres, on la trouvait dans l'inégalité des fortunes et des conditions et en dernière analyse dans la propriété individuelle, par laquelle les plus adroits et les plus heureux dépouillèrent et dépouillent sans cesse la multitude qui astreinte à des travaux longs et pénibles, mal nourrie, mal vêtue, et mal logée, privée des jouissances qu'elle voit se multiplier pour quelques uns

In the *Tribune* Babeuf advocated that all labor must be regulated by law. None was to be exempt, and none should be overburdened. The feeble were not to be idle, but were to be relieved from heavy labor, and stronger members were to endure the greater hardships.¹ Such was the theory advocated by this organ of the most radical group of the revolutionary period. Most of it, no doubt, emanated from Babeuf; at least he would have accepted it all.

The theories of Babeuf are found principally in certain fragments discovered in his room at the time of his execution.² The chief classes which he distinguishes are the rich and the poor; it is this difference in wealth that makes for social unrest. These social distinctions, he says, are pernicious and unnatural.³ There are, he says, but two grounds for social distinction — age and sex. All having the same needs and the same powers, all should enjoy the same opportunities for culture and the same material support. There is only et minée par la misère, par l'ignorance, par l'envie, et par le désespoir dans ses forces physiques et morales, ne voit dans la société qu'un ennui." — Buonarroti, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-85.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 210-211.

² The inscriptions of these are: "Haute cour de justice; Copie des pièces, saisies dans le local que Babeuf occupait lors de son arrestation à Paris, Frumaire, an V."

³ "Qu'il cesse enfin ce grand scandale que nos neveux ne voudront pas croire? disparaissent enfin révoltantes distinctions de riches et de pauvres; de grands et de petits, de maîtres et de valets, de gouvernants et de gouvernés." — *Ibid.*, Vol. I, piece 52, p. 161.

one sun, and it shines alike on all; why, then, should not all have the same means of life and the same pleasures? ¹

Babeuf taught that in a primitive state of society men were all equal. Inequality arose with early civilization, and then this inequality was fixed and established in the civil law. To-day equality in theory is very well; but so far, in practice, it is chimerical. All should be equal before the law, all being born equal; unless they have signed away their liberty, they should be free and equal.²

On the validity of property Babeuf made a few very definite statements. To him the "Agrarian Law" was but a compromise and did not solve the problem. It was necessary to take a more radical course; the only way to solve the social question permanently was to entirely abandon private property. All goods should be reduced to communal control.³ Babeuf considered

¹ "Ils se contentent d'un seul soleil et d'un même air pour tous; pourquoi la même portion et la même qualité d'aliments ne suffiraient-elles pas à chacun d'eux?" — *Ibid.*, piece 52.

² "Nous sommes tous égaux, n'est-ce pas? ce principe demeure incontesté, parcequ'à moins d'être atteint de folie on ne saurait dire sérieusement qu'il fait nuit quand il fait jour." — *Ibid.*, piece 52, p. 160.

³ "Nous tendons à quelque chose de plus sublime et de plus équitable, le bien commun ou la communanté des biens." — *Ibid.*, p. 161.

"Le droit de propriété est celui qui appartient à tout citoyen de jouir et de disposer à son gré de ses biens, de ses revenus, du fruit de son travail et de son industrie." — Article 16, Declaration of Rights, 1793. Article 18 forbade property in persons.

the ownership of land particularly unfortunate.¹ Property in goods might be tolerated; but private ownership in land, he held, was both unnatural and injudicious. Through the existence of private property there is created a leisure class, and the great majority are thus compelled to labor for the pleasure of the extreme minority.

In his attack on society Babeuf shows clearly that he has the concrete case of France in view. The power of the great lords and of the propertied class he condemns as oppressive and intolerable. Too long the system of large holders had oppressed the great body of non-property holders.²

Of the same nature was the demand of the Insurrectionary Committee. It held in the first place that property rights were not based upon the law of nature, but were only a creation of the civil law. This being the case, the people could at any time change, revise, or abolish the rights of private property. It advised that ownership of goods be lodged in society, and that this should inhere inalienably in the whole people;

¹ "Plus de propriété individuelle des terres, la terre n'est à personne. Nous réclamons, nous voulons la jouissance communale des fruits de la terre. Les fruits sont à tout le monde." — Babeuf, "Manifesto," p. 152.

² "Assez et trop longtemps moins d'un million d'individus dispose de ce qui appartient à plus de vingt millions de leurs semblables, de leurs égaux." — *Ibid.*, p. 152.

with them alone should reside the power to regulate employment and distribute the product of public industry.¹

As was the case with most of these writers, especially during the Revolution, Babeuf had complete faith in the possibility of his radical scheme. Before his execution he had seen the chief features of the plans of the "Mountain" carried into effect. The political aspects of the Revolution had clearly shown the possibility of very radical social changes. He died before the reaction toward monarchy under the Directory had set in, or the reversion to absolutism under the imperial régime of Napoleon had dimmed the red glory of the tragic revolutionary days. He carried to his grave the faith that those great social changes for which he had stood might yet be fulfilled.²

Babeuf held that society must always be troubled by dissensions so long as such disproportions exist between the resources of the different social classes. His treatment of the Revolution may be called a social-economic discussion. Many writers were occupied

¹ Buonarroti, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

² "La Révolution, nous a donné preuves sur preuves que le peuple français, peut être un grand et vieux peuple, n'est-ce pas? Pour cela incapable d'adopter les plus grands changements dans ses institutions, de consentir aux plus grands sacrifices pour les améliorer. N'a-t-il pastout changé depuis 1789 excepté cette seule institution de la propriété?" — "Manifesto," Vol. 1, piece 5.

chiefly with the fiscal and political aspects of the age; they were more interested in the government and in its structure, disregarding the social constitution.¹ Babeuf viewed the government merely as a means to the support and happiness of all the members of society. "Je vais plus loin que, soit que l'en combatte ou non, le sol d'un état doit assurer l'existence à tous les membres de cet état." Babeuf sought to reestablish the equilibrium between the classes as regards wealth. This he believed the only means whereby society might become safe and stable. The remedy for France was to be sought in the reform of the social rather than in that of the civil or political constitution.²

Babeuf was much of a dreamer. He was far less practical than those revolutionary spirits to whom freedom from political oppression meant so much and who hoped for readjustment through reforms in the government. He was therefore out of sympathy with those who had liberty as their ideal. To Babeuf these attempts at social amelioration through political reform were mere time-serving; he abandoned these for a more far-reaching policy where complete equality as a basis of social reform was accepted. Babeuf idealized equality, forgetting, as did so many writers of his stamp, the idea

¹ Faure, "Le Socialisme pendant la Révolution française," p. 55.

² *Ibid.*, p. 51. Cf. Speeches of Desmoulins before the Convention, "Tracts."

of liberty which had been the watchword of the Revolution. This doctrine of social equality was the direct contribution of these radicals to the Revolution. The idea of liberty belonged to the radical political parties. It was the latter and not the former that produced the French Revolution. In this sense the Revolution was not socialistic.¹

10. Among those who, like Babeuf, considered social equality an essential to liberty and justice in France, was the radical theorist and doctrinaire, Saint-Just. He pointed out, though less explicitly, that the hopes for practical liberty and social justice without an economic reconstruction were groundless. He thought that if the Revolution was to work out the welfare of the lower-classes, radical social and industrial changes must be realized.

The literature from the pen of Saint-Just is not extensive, and little of that is available. The most

¹ "All these rogues, swept by each other from the Jacobins, have at last made room for Danton, Robespierre, and Lindet, for those general deputies of every department, mountaineers of the Convention; the bulwarks of the Republic whose thoughts have never wandered a moment from their object; the *political* and *individual liberty* of every citizen, a constitution worthy of Solon or Lycurgus, one indivisible Republic; the splendor and prosperity of France, not an impracticable equality of property, but an equality of rights and happiness." — Speech of Camille Desmoulins, "Tracts." Cf. Speech of Mallet du Pan, *Ibid.*, 1793.

valuable source for his ideas is "Fragments sur les Institutions Républicaines."¹

The key to the teaching of Saint-Just is his treatment of what he considered the social unit under the present régime — the family. As a basis of the union of the sexes he placed conjugal love, and taught that a form of marriage exists wherever there is discovered spiritual affinity. In this respect he is at one with such English radicals as Godwin, Shelley, Byron, and the like. His theory meant the dissolution of family life as it exists in a régime where marriage is held sacred and property rights are inviolable. His theory of marriage resembles the common law marriage.² His teachings were, however, of a chivalrous kind.³ As in the Spartan state barrenness was a cause for separation, so Saint-Just would allow divorce if there were no offspring for seven years. Children were after a certain age to become wards of the state.⁴ From the fifth to the tenth year the state was to train the children that they might become proper citizens.

¹ It bears the inscription, "Ouvrage posthume de Saint-Just précédé d'une notice par Nodier, Paris, 1831."

² "L'homme et la femme qui s'aiment sont époux, s'ils n'ont point d'enfants ils peuvent tenir leur engagement secret; mais si l'épouse devient grosse ils sont tenus de déclarer qu'ils sont époux au magistrat." — "Fragment," p. 60.

³ "Celui qui frappe une femme est banni. Les femmes ne peuvent être censurées." — *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁴ "L'enfant du citoyen appartient à la patrie." — *Ibid.*

II. The discussion of the family and its proposed reorganization naturally led Saint-Just to a brief consideration of economic questions. With an unstable form of family came the problem of the control of property. If the right of inheritance was not to be maintained, Saint-Just saw that with no succession in family lines either the state must be made the residuary claimant or else anarchy as to the control of property must ensue. He had, therefore, a rather unique plan whereby property would gradually revert to the state. In case husband and wife separated, an occurrence he seemed to expect, one-half the property escheated to society, the other half was to be divided between the separated parties.¹ Inheritance was to be tolerated in direct line alone. He denied emphatically the right of succession in collateral lines.² Saint-Just advocated the equal division of property among all the children, a proposition that became law in France in 1793, and which holds good to-day.

Saint-Just condemned idleness as one of the evils in

¹ "S'ils se séparent, la moitié de la communauté leur appartient; ils la partagent également entre eux; l'autre moitié appartient aux enfants; s'il n'y a point d'enfants elle appartient au domaine public." — *Ibid.*, p. 61.

² "L'hérédité est exclusive entre les parents directs. Les parents directs sont les aînés, le père et la mère, les enfants, le frère et la sœur. Les parents indirects ne se succèdent point. La République succède à ceux qui meurent sans parents directs." — *Ibid.*, p. 63.

society and made no provision for a leisure class in his republic. He showed a partiality to agriculture and displayed ¹ the influence of an agricultural environment and of physiocracy. One kind of labor uniformly required of all was farm labor.

Saint-Just partook of the prevalent spirit of optimism, so characteristic of his country and of his age. In the future of society, if regulated according to his ideal, he had the fullest confidence. He thoroughly believed that society might develop objectively along lines of his abstract theories.²

12. It has been pointed out that a large part of the radical theories of Mably were provoked by the bitter discussion which he had with the great leader of the physiocratic school, Mercier de la Rivière, the most philosophic writer of that school.³ Mably rather turned aside to take up this opposition to Mercier and answered him in a work of considerable strength. His

¹ "Tout propriétaire qui n'exerce point de métier, qui n'est point magistrat, qui a plus de vingt-cinq ans est tenu de cultiver la terre jusqu'à cinquante ans."—"Fragment," p. 70.

² Kritschewsky, "J. J. Rousseau und Saint-Just; ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der socialpolitischen Ideen der Montagnards," 1895, p. 41.

³ "L'ordre naturel et essentiel des sociétés," 1767. Cf. Higgs "The Physiocrats," six lectures on the French economists of the eighteenth century; "Revue Sociale Catholique," pp. 256 *et seq.*; Legrand, R., "Richard Cantillon, un Mercantiliste Précurseur des Physiocrates"; Vogel, "Over de Leer der Physiokraten," 1859.

main work had been devoted to the larger field of history and jurisprudence, in which sphere he did rather an extensive service. The general ability of the man, however, did much to give popularity to his views, and he received considerable attention in his immediate age.¹

Mably, then, like many of his day and school, was inclined at first to the ancient mode of thought and was a very devoted student of history.² While in his writings there can be traced his opposition to the institutions of his age, it was after the dogmatic work of Mercier defending the system of physiocracy and in particular the institution of private property that Mably took up a most radical propaganda.³

The leading features of interest in the career of

¹ His most important works are: "Doutes proposés aux Philosophes économiques, sur l'Ordre naturel et essentiel des Sociétés politiques," 1768; "De la Législation ou Principes des Lois"; "Observations sur l'Histoire de France," 3 vols.; "Principes des Négociations pour servir d'Introduction au Droit Public de l'Europe," etc.

² On Mably see Béranger, "Esprit de Mably et de Condillac relativement à la morale et à la politique," 1789; Le C. Lavacher, "De l'homme en société; complément à la législation de Mably," 2 vols., 1804.

³ Mably was born in Grenoble in 1709. He was determined for the church orders and at an early age began the study of theology. Like others of his age, as Voltaire, Meslier, and the like, he became dissatisfied with clerical teachings and practice, and abandoned the church to take part in the more stirring thought and activity of society and the state. In his history of France he showed marked ability as a historian, and in his treatise on the public law of Europe is seen another side of this versatile character. He died in 1785.

Mably were his extreme boldness, his great logical power, and the ability he displayed in his struggle with the physiocratic school,—a fact which alone would have brought any man to prominence. Mably was a contemporary of Morelly, and while he lacked in constructive genius, surpassed that writer in destructive criticism. The occasion of Mably's attack on society in general and on property in particular was the appearance of the physiocratic defence of property and of the existing order in "L'Ordre Naturel et Essentiel de Société" from the pen of the ablest physiocrat, Mercier de la Rivière. To this Mably made reply in his "Doutes proposés aux Philosophes économiques sur l'Ordre naturel et essentiel des Sociétés politiques." This appeared in 1768, after the writings of Rousseau and Morelly. It was in response to these that Mercier had written his defence of the existing régime.

Equally as suggestive of the new and destructive of the old order were the ideas advanced by Mably. Mably was interested, as were Morelly and Rousseau, to find the causes of social evil and the means for their removal. With them he held the source of social ills to be private property. Inequality and property he associated as cause and effect. Both equality and communal right to material goods he called natural rights. Both of these man lost when he abandoned natural society. Both inequality and its corollary,

private property, are the result of convention; they are neither the natural nor essential basis of society, as Mercier had claimed; neither are they to be tolerated on grounds of expediency, as had been taught by Rousseau.

Like Morelly, Mably was specific and accurate in his analysis. He attempted to discover and point out the real relation between property and inequality. This lies chiefly in the advantages the possession of wealth gives the holder; advantages in education and in culture and in those things which lend distinction and power. Here originate social classes, and here the pernicious influences of inequality begin.

While Mably thus theoretically condemned property and the evils which flow from it, in practice he was moderate like Rousseau. At the time he wrote, he believed these institutions still necessary to maintain the social order; at the same time he held that they were not necessarily the final order. The only actual change he advised was a limitation upon the amount of land any one could hold.¹ A. Franck points out the relation of Mably to Morelly in these concise words: "Mably has the glory of having given to communism its most concise and logical form; but two things remained to be done: to give to the theory the imperative character of law, or to embody it in the form of a code and to put

¹ "Doutes proposés," etc., p. 162.

it into action. The first was done by Morelly, the second by Babeuf."¹

13. The theories set forth by Linguet are suggestive of the same radical social thought, although his writings were not generally of a revolutionary color. He was a poet, dramatist, historian, journalist, and a thorough student of the law.² Lichtenberger considers Linguet as a very direct and important forerunner of modern socialism. Much of his thought is not, however, connected very closely with the theories here discussed. The most radical parts deal with the problem of property. Less revolutionary than Morelly or Mably, his method of attack was similar.

Property lies at the basis of extravagance and luxury on one hand and of poverty and squalor on the other. He says it is the wealth arising through the accumulation of private property that creates an idle rich class, who live from the labor of the less fortunate class.³ Prop-

¹ Franck, "Communisme jugé par l'histoire," Paris, 1849, p. 59.

² Linguet was born at Rheims in 1736. He held a place of note as a writer and legal authority during the closing half of the eighteenth century. His leading work was "Théories des lois civiles; ou Principes Fondamentaux de la Société," London, 1767. Cf. Hugo und Stegmann, "Handbuch des Socialismus," pp. 472 *et seq.*; Cruppi, "Un Avocat journaliste au 18^{me} Siècle, Linguet," 1895; Monselet, "Les Oubliés et les Dédaignés," Alençon, 1857, pp. 1-47; Lichtenberger, "Le Socialisme Utopique," pp. 75-131.

³ "L'accroissement de ces biens lui fait imaginer les distinctions. Il l'amène à désirer le superflu et son opulence lui donne le moyen de le payer." — "Théories des lois civiles," Paris, 1767, Ch. III.

erty fosters luxury, creates class-distinctions, and, making possible a leisure class, compels labor to bear their burdens.¹ He does not, however, see this as the worst evil. Property is injurious to the entire society. Through luxury and extravagance the population is lessened and society is weakened. He attacks private property from the social view point and sees the general interests at war with the interests of the dominant social classes.² Property he considers the basis of society as at present organized. To upset property would mean to revolutionize society. Property, like government, is a necessary evil. Law he defines as the protector of those who have against those who have not.³ Linguet saw much as did Harrington a vital union between property and a stable society. He justifies private property because it saves society from that anarchy from which it has emerged.⁴

14. The writer of this period who saw most clearly the economic causes which operate in history in general and which caused the French Revolution in particular, was Barnave.⁵ As a necessary outgrowth of this view

¹ *Ibid.*, Ch. VI.

² *Ibid.*, Ch. VIII.

³ "Elles tendent à mettre l'homme qui possède du superflu à couvert des attaques de celui qui n'a pas le nécessaire." *Ibid.*, p. 196.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁵ As is the case with other authors here noted, Barnave has been very much neglected. He was born at Grenoble in 1761 and suffered death by the guillotine in 1793. He was a lawyer by profession. Barnave was an ardent follower of Montesquieu and received much

of history he also saw the rise of the classes and discussed the part which economic changes have played in history. In this respect he bears very close resemblance to Marx. To M. Jaurès¹ the credit is largely due of discovering Barnave and placing him in his proper position regarding the theory of his own day and of later times.²

Barnave was more than a mere political agitator or narrow-minded revolutionist. His activities and interests had marked him as a man with large powers and great possibilities surpassed by Mirabeau alone among the revolutionary leaders. His knowledge of the colonial situation, of the larger aspects of French administration, and of the operations in the local and national legislative bodies especially fitted him to take the economist's view of the great Revolution.³ Jaurès

of his inspiration from him. He was a member of the estates-general of 1789 and president of the Assembly in 1790. At first a radical democrat, the drift of the Revolution of 1791 convinced him of the need of a more conservative course into which he attempted to lead the Assembly. He pleaded the inviolability of the king's person in the Convention of 1792.

¹ Jaurès, "Histoire Socialiste," Vol. I, pp. 97 *et seq.*

² The writings of Barnave were collected and published in 1843 by Béranger in four volumes. His most important contribution for purposes of this essay was "Introduction à la Révolution française." Quite a number of pamphlets have been left by Barnave on practical subjects concerning finance, colonies, and administration.

³ See de Loménie, "Esquisses Historiques et Littéraires"; Barnave, "Rapport fait à l'Assemblée, sur les Colonies," 1791;

says of Barnave, that he most clearly stated the principles on which the Revolution advanced, in which he discerned those economic causes which were later so much emphasized by Marx. He also claims that Marx has ignored in him a most important precursor.¹ During the Revolution he was on the side of the third estate, voted with them, spoke for them, and when conferences were held, he was named as the conferee. His attitude was rather that of the practical statesman and reformer than of the radical doctrinaire.² Of all the revolutionary group, with perhaps the exception of Mirabeau, Barnave was the most conservative, cautious, and useful. Although at first on the side of the radicals, he advised measures of practical reform which tended to allay the bitterness of the classes and to moderate the fury of the revolutionary conflict.

"Procès-Verbal de l'Assemblée Nationale; 15 Juillet," 1791; Béranger, "Notice historique sur Barnave" in "Œuvres de Barnave," 1843. Attention has already been called to the fact that the period of Marx saw a revival of interest in the prerevolutionary writings. This edition of Barnave's works, appearing in 1843, is another illustration of this. Buonarroti's life of Babeuf came earlier, 1828.

¹ "Histoire Socialiste," Vol. I, pp. 97-98. Béranger, *op. cit.*, Introduction.

² He opposed the absolute veto of the king; advocated the division of France into departments and the enlargement of the local powers; he was in favor of the introduction of the trial by jury for both criminal and civil cases. Over the powers of the king as to war and peace occurred the debate between Mirabeau and Barnave which alone would have made either man famous.

As has been already pointed out, certain very fundamental differences in view mark the earlier as distinguished from the modern socialism. Among these none is more important than the recognition of the evolutionary nature of society and the necessary belief that social reforms, if carried through, must move slowly. To this proposition Barnave clearly committed himself. This fact appears both in his activities in the national assembly and in his writings touching this subject.¹

Of the influences of the external environment and of the dominant cultural forces on the social and political forms, Barnave was completely convinced. Power in government and social prestige depend, he says, upon a certain conjunction of outward circumstances, and are largely independent of the will of the different individuals. Society develops according to certain natural laws, and beyond these the controlling power of the social will cannot go.²

According to Barnave the chief external factor determining social and political development is the economic condition. His clear recognition of this principle in

¹ "Ainsi les gouvernements changent de forme quelquefois par une progression douce et insensible, et quelquefois par de violentes commotions." — "Introduction à la Révolution française," p. 3.

² "C'est la nature des choses, la période sociale où le peuple est arrivé, la terre qu'il habite, ses richesses, ses besoins, ses habitudes, ses mœurs, qui distribuent le pouvoir." — *Ibid.*, p. 3.

general makes his connection with Marx apparent; while his attitude toward property and its relation to human progress shows his sympathy with the authors earlier discussed.

The theory of Barnave as to social origins is almost identical with that of Morelly and Rousseau. Early society is marked by communism as to property and equality and liberty as to person. At first there may be some ownership of implements, but the land is held entirely in common.¹

With Morelly, Barnave states that the chief dynamic social force is the increase of population. As this multiplies, new needs present themselves, the individual begins to feel his insufficiency, and necessity forces or induces him to seek the coöperation of others similarly situated. In this social coöperation society originates. It will be observed that the writers here examined hold that the economic needs lie at the foundation of the social structure. Barnave holds thus far to an economic theory as to social development. He also teaches, and in this he differs from Hobbes, that not fear, but the mutual feeling of coöperation and a need of social aid in economic endeavors lead men to enter society.

But this increase of population and its accompanying growth of social life has another outgrowth of the utmost importance in the process of social movements. At

¹ "La terre entière est commune à tous." — *Ibid.*, p. 5.

this stage appears the system of property. At first developing slowly with a nomad people, it takes on a very great, indeed a commanding, importance when the tribes become fixed to the soil.¹ Because of this, men abandon their freedom in two ways. In the first place, they submit themselves to nature and the tyranny of her laws, losing that freedom marking life by the chase.²

More important, however, than this unavoidable subjection to nature through this industrial change, is the rise of social classes due to the equally inevitable growth of inequality, based upon economic differences. Barnave emphasizes the fact that with the growth of landed property, inequalities came to be fixed in fact and law, and the basis for permanent social classes and class-distinctions was laid. Barnave emphasizes the very significant fact that inequality fixes itself not alone in the laws and institutions of the country, but in the nature of men. The original feeling of independence and of self-sufficiency passes away, and the condition of poverty reacts upon the individual character. Nowhere is the English adage more clearly stated, that the

¹ "Enfin, les besoins de la population s'accroissant toujours, l'homme est obligé de chercher sa nourriture dans le sein de la terre." — "Introduction à la Révolution française," p. 6.

² "Le cultivateur sacrifie ainsi toute l'indépendance que la nature lui a donnée; le sol l'enchaîne parce qu'il le fait vivre." — *Ibid.*, p. 9.

"destruction of the poor is their poverty." ¹ Such was the theory of Barnave explaining the rise of inequality and the manner whereby it perpetuates itself in society.

With equal clearness he points out, how, under the pressure of economic necessity society passes from one industrial stage to another. If Barnave was a precursor of Karl Marx in his social views, and especially in the emphasis he placed on the influence of the economic factor, he even more clearly anticipated Frederick List ² in stating the theory of the evolution of society through a series of industrial stages. He discusses society as it advances, under the pressure of increasing population, through four stages : the hunting, agricultural, agricultural-manufacturing, and the commercial stages. The classification by List is somewhat more complex; it is no more clearly conceived nor logically stated. Throughout the discussion Barnave holds to the idea that society constantly unfolds under the pressure of economic necessity.³

As a result of this rather interesting analysis of society Barnave reaches some important conclusions.

¹ "Enfin dans cet âge de la société le pauvre n'est pas moins asservi par son ignorance; il a perdu cette sagacité naturelle, cette hardiesse d'imagination qui caractérisent l'homme errant dans les bois." — *Ibid.*, p. 10.

² Frederick List, "Das Nationale System der Politischen Oekonomie," 1845, Ch. 13.

³ "Introduction à la Révolution française," pp. 10-13.

His statement of the manner in which the propertied class captured the organs of control and turned them to their own account could scarcely be improved upon.¹ In like manner, he has expressed the theory of a class-struggle and the actual formation and destruction of classes in modern Europe as a result of the changes in the control over economic goods. In the very midst of the great revolutionary struggle, Barnave saw the rise of the democracy and of a new aristocracy. These he interpreted, however, not as political but as economic phenomena.

To him the great Revolution was an economic and not a political event. As property shifted from land into capital, the old landed aristocracy lost its control, and the equilibrium of power thus disturbed sought and found a new centre in the rising democracy which had come into prominence through this great industrial change.² Through the centuries these changes had been in progress until the growth of capital had made the supremacy of the landed interests no longer pos-

¹ "Comme, avant l'époque où le commerce existe, l'aristocratie est, par la nature des choses, en possession du pouvoir, c'est elle alors qui fait les lois, qui crée les préjugés et qui dirige les habitudes des peuples; elle pourra balancer longtemps, par l'énergie des institutions, l'influence des causes naturelles." — "Introduction à la Révolution française," p. 13.

² "Les communes acquérant des richesses par le travail ont acheté d'abord leur liberté et ensuite une portion des terres et l'aristocratie a perdu successivement son empire et ses richesses." — *Ibid.*, p. 19.

sible. It was when the balance of power fell on the side of capital that the French Revolution was made possible and necessary.¹

¹ "C'est cette progression, commune à tous les gouvernements européens, qui a préparé en France une révolution démocratique, et l'a fait éclater à la fin du XVIII^{me} siècle." — *Ibid.*, p. 20.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

SOCIAL inequalities, political injustice, and class-distinctions have, in a variety of forms, marked the progress of human society. Many causes have contributed to the spirit of unrest and to conflict of interests. To what extent these unfortunate conditions rest on economic maladjustment can be only roughly estimated. It was a characteristic of the writers before the French Revolution to attribute many social and political wrongs to unwise economic arrangements. Their proposed remedy would be called socialistic because it hoped for amelioration through changes in the economic system. The chief feature of these changes was the extension of public power into the sphere of industry before occupied by the individual.

Socialism now as then is called upon to meet and solve some very difficult problems. It is necessary to consider the question whether socialism is adapted to human nature, and whether there are any permanent, enduring qualities in man. It will not do to assume that society has always been dominated by the economic motive nor that man has always been mercenary in spirit. Outside the sphere of predatory life there is

probably much ground for Spencer's subdivision of society into militant and industrial society. Many eras in history might be pointed out in which other motives than the economic seem to have dominated.¹ It is highly probable that socialists have overestimated the completeness of their analysis and that great disappointments might follow socialistic experiments. Although modern socialism has become more scientific in spirit and historical in method, there still linger many suggestions of its origin in the sentimental theories of the past. There is still regnant a spirit of unreasoned hopefulness in the omnipotence of the social will. The vicious assumption still persists that a condition of social quietism can be reached and maintained.² Such a condition is neither hoped for nor expected by social students; for the questions concerning the reconciliation of socialism and evolution discussed by Haeckel and Virchow in 1877 have not been answered. In the light of evolutionary teaching, it is not at all clear how society devoid of conflict can make progress. If progress depends upon selection and this is conditioned upon conflict, socialism, however humane, seems to be unfavorable to progress.³ Socialists

¹ Peixotto, *op. cit.*, p. 300, note.

² For a discussion of this see Bernstein, "Voraussetzungen des Socialismus," pp. 169 *et seq.*

³ Mackaye, "The Economy of Happiness," N. Y., 1907, discusses the chances of a happy adjustment of social relations under another régime.

themselves must regard the very reasonable fear that society might stagnate. There is danger that a scheme of mutuality would transform society into a mere nerveless mass, — inert, unprogressive, moribund, and like feudalism lead nowhere but to its own destruction.

Furthermore, as socialism moves from the realm of utopias, vague theories, and pleasing generalizations into a sphere of practical schemes and attempted reform, the fact of the changing nature of industrial society presents itself to confuse and complicate. Socialists themselves have not been blind to those changes. Indeed, they have been most persistent in pointing out the fact that society progresses in cycles as classes become endowed with new economic powers. Landlordism gives way to capitalism and the feudal "Aristocracy" to the "Bourgeoisie."¹ This class, in turn, is to be overthrown as the proletariat gains on one hand and the giant industry on the other.

Equally great changes take place in the industrial methods and in the forms of industrial organization. Manufacture and commerce have come to take the place of agriculture as dominant facts in industrial life. The household has yielded to the factory in the sphere of manufacture, and handicraft to labor with the machine. Instead of goods made to special order, commodities are manufactured for the general market.

¹ Jaurès, "Histoire Socialiste," Vol. I, pp. 96 *et seq.*

Prices earlier based upon agreement between consumer and producer were for a century settled by competition, but owing to vast changes they are now fixed by contract between producers under conditions of partial monopoly, or by the manufacturers where the monopoly is complete.

As a result of these changes socialism has been compelled to abandon many of its conclusions, and has seen many of its earlier hopes shattered and its assumptions disproved. At first it waged war on free competition and saw in this industrial anarchy in society one of the main causes of its protest. The past quarter of a century has seen the system of competitive industry disappear while a new and worse enemy in the form of monopoly has appeared. With the enormous widening of the markets during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the hopes of cosmopolitan industry and world-markets under the régime of free trade seemed to be realized. With the rebirth of nationalism, with the Civil War in America, the unification of Italy, and the creation of the German Empire and the consequent isolation of France, these hopes have been overthrown. With the growth of this new nationalism and the attendant spirit of mercantilism, shown in all important lands, new difficulties present themselves. The first of these was seen in the seventies, when, as a result of the Franco-German War, the famous

"International" was hopelessly wrecked, and again the dreams of a world-wide brotherhood were shattered. Later examples of the influence of this mercantile spirit are seen as western nations, in their struggle for markets, cling with tenacity to the existing type of organization lest any change in method destroy their power; while new lands, like Japan, adopt the most advanced form of capitalistic industry.

Moreover, with the growth of the machine-industry has come a minute division of labor. The effects of this change, discussed ever since the classical analysis of Adam Smith, have not yet been shown in their social bearing; for this subdivision of labor has developed a vast difference of skill among laborers and a corresponding variety of wage. As the wages vary so vary the standards, and this, as has been said, is destructive of class-sympathy and of class-struggle. Not only do the categories of skilled and unskilled labor play a most important rôle in trade-union organization, but they must soon be a cause of apprehension for socialist leaders.

In this connection attention is called to the larger aspects of this division of labor. No fact is more apparent nor has any been more fortunate, than the tendency of social institutions to develop along the line of their separate functions. From the age of Thomas More on, this growth of division of labor is

manifest. The power to dominate the beliefs of men and to deal with problems of morals has gradually been relegated to the sphere of the church. Slowly did the church abandon those claims so long urged to govern in civil affairs, leaving a certain area undisputed to the state. As a part of this same movement the individual grew in power as an economic unit, and as individualism developed, he gained control over his industrial activity. In so far, then, as progress involves this growth of the individual, socialism is reactionary and retrogressive. It conflicts with the century-old tendency toward division of labor in this enlarged social sense. It totally confuses the spheres of civic and economic activity, degrading the state from the high purpose to which it was born, to govern in the former, and denying to man at once the privilege and responsibility to work out unhindered his economic career in the latter.

Karl Marx was the last and the greatest philosopher of socialism. In his masterpiece, "Capital," theorizing, both sentimental and scientific, finds its climax and its close. In his activities as an organizer and agitator he came into contact with those economic facts with which socialism was forced to deal and thus connects the old with the new socialism. To these mighty changes so soon to disturb industrial society, the earlier theorists paid little heed. They were idealists and cared little for the hard social facts which

their followers must meet. So long as socialism was academic this was well; when, in the fifties, it became a class-movement at the hands of Marx and Lassalle, the principles which had grown into a cult and those economic doctrines on which they were based came to be severely tried.

Among those principles one of the most important was that the effects of the socialistic propaganda were to reach all lands, and this industrial brotherhood was to embrace all mankind. The cosmopolitan nature of the teachings of More and Campanella has been pointed out. Utopia was a microcosm, the prototype of a perfect society, where all would be free and where toleration would be complete. The practical application of this theory was the "International" of Karl Marx. These hopes, however, were disappointed in the seventies because of national enmities; while to-day there appears the still more difficult problem of treating the different races which press themselves on the western world. As the practical questions growing out of increased immigration knocked the idealism out of early American democracy and placed laws on the statute books limiting certain races from entering, so has the same development of the race problem wrecked the liberal cosmopolitan pretensions of early socialism. The recent drift of affairs shows that socialism is limited to the white race at least, with still narrower

bounds possible. At this point the idealism of socialism has broken down, regardless of what effects may follow as to its practical programme. As a system of selfishness it may still persist; its altruistic claims it will probably abandon.¹

It is even true that within the national groups themselves the unprecedented growth of cities, with their giant activities, threatens to still further break down the social solidarity. The necessities of the case leading to the ownership of the public utilities may be the entering wedge for a large socialistic control, but the effects of this on the growth of socialism may be very doubtful. Municipal socialism has been carried far in France, and its sentiment gains ground rapidly in America; yet such development seems to conflict with the larger intent of early socialism. Not only is this so, but it is very uncertain whether the centralized type of government and the concentrated form of control now on the increase are compatible with the drift socialism is taking in the direction of social democracy.

While this seems a reversion toward the ideals appearing in prerevolutionary socialism, yet the great political changes here suggested have compelled the abandonment of one of its most distinctive principles; namely, its absolute monarchic nature. No question has more severely shaken the system than

¹ Clark, "The Labor Movement in Australasia," N. Y., 1906, p. 135.

the attempt to reconcile the spirit of early socialism with the spirit of democracy. The career of the Social Democracy in Germany, marked by the struggle to impress this new spirit on socialism, clearly illustrates how the changes of the past century have transformed the early method of socialism. The "prince" and the "hierarchy" adhered to in the earlier centuries must yield to the decentralized rule of the people as "social democracy" collides with "state socialism."

It is owing also to this growth of democracy that the radical nature of prerevolutionary socialism has been much modified. Democracy means the coming to power of the lower classes without disturbing the existing economic equilibrium. It makes possible the participation of the lower classes in new privileges and rights without altering, in the least, industrial relationships. Two results have followed, both of the first importance to the radical type of socialism. Some have been satisfied with the form of power though they may lack the substance and be in no better condition economically. Another and far larger class uses the new power thus given it to ameliorate conditions and improve that social system it earlier was bent on destroying. Hence, there is lacking to-day that singleness of purpose so characteristic of prerevolutionary theorists, and the reformer is more in evidence than the revolutionary; while the programmes of modern socialist

congresses provide for a most general scheme of political and social reform.

Indeed, the danger seems imminent that socialism will lose its distinctive features and be merged into very liberal reform parties. The bitterness of the debate between Bebel and Jaurès in the Brussels congress shows how seriously this fear is entertained by the ablest representatives of socialism to-day. For, as Proudhon said, if socialism means merely reform, then are we all socialists. Instances are not wanting to show that radical action was averted by the adoption of reform measures; this was the case in France in the great Revolution and again in 1848. Bismarck took the wind out of the socialists' sails in Germany by yielding to various reforms. While to the more cynical critic many of these measures of aid and reform may suggest the creation of a "Benevolent Feudalism," still there are many who believe moderate reform is worth striving for, while many others do not object to being taken care of. While this was not the chief point at issue between the radical Lassalle and the conservative Schultze-Delitzsch, yet the danger of the reformer's cutting the ground from under the socialist has been apparent since then. It is over the nature of the programme which socialists are to follow in this connection that the threatening break has come in the party in Germany, the injurious effects of which are apparent to-day.

The problem, however, in its widest extent involves the relationship of the modern trades-unions to socialism. The fate of socialism in the near future at least, either as a system of faith or active propaganda, depends largely on the attitude which these powerful organizations of laborers assume. Prerevolutionary socialism, and indeed socialism down to very modern times, had no conflict either in theory or practice with a rival system. Its exponents were the only representatives of the submerged classes, and the contradictions between the radical socialist and the practical reformer were not at all apparent until agitation, due partly to itself and partly to rival organizations, opened a positive campaign for the betterment of the class in question.

Of the attempts made to carry out these ideal schemes little can be said. Many attempts have been made to realize the early dreams through the organization of ideal communities. The only one of any importance, the Jesuit experiment in Paraguay, has been already discussed. The more recent ones have been on a much smaller scale and have served no purpose but to show how futile such attempts are, or to give social students and dilettantes in reform the opportunity to establish social experiment stations. Undertaken by impractical dreamers with impossible theories, they have had no more influence on the existing social system than had the republic of Saint Marino on the monarchic system

of Europe. These communities have been marked by interesting though totally unimportant features, such as the sensational communism of Oneida, the puerile mutualism of Amana, or the travesty on finance of Zion City. These experiments from Icaria to the present have been viewed with mingled feelings of sympathy and distrust. There has been radical legislation in some places, such as that in Australasia; but these movements are free from the unworkable plans here discussed.

The opposition to property, both individual and corporate, which More entertained, has been evident since in a variety of forms. It appeared in the French Revolution in the radical theories discussed above and in the milder protest against the lands of the clergy. Bentham argues very clearly and forcefully against the right of inheritance, especially in collateral lines. Marx and Engels in their Communist Manifesto took a very radical stand, much modified by their later utterances, in which capital alone falls under the ban. Proudhon's doctrine condemns property in a still more severe manner. Modern socialism in its programmes still attacks vigorously the right of property, though current opinion is by no means at one on this proposition.

The effect of the increase of the number of property-holders especially among laborers has probably strengthened sentiment in its favor. The opposition aroused

because of the abuses of corporate wealth is largely neutralized by the increased influence of small stockholders.¹ The movement toward municipal ownership in the cities has chiefly to do with franchises and does not at all prove that the opposition to private property is growing. It has, with the inheritance tax, principally a fiscal significance. The attack on landed property, led in America by Henry George and in England by Mr. Wallace, which took the form of land nationalization, arose from the unfortunate use made of public lands in this country and the hated landlordism in England. The movement in both countries was based upon passing phenomena and should not be interpreted as directed in principle against property.

The attacks on the family so fully developed in the prerevolutionary writings have, it may be said, very much subsided since the Revolution. Much has been written recently bearing upon this question, but chiefly by cynical critics, sensational writers, and social students whose works are largely academic in their appeal unless some oversensitive person feels either offended or frightened, and by opposition gives such works general notoriety. Prophecies of the decline of the family are based generally either upon unfortunate personal experiences or statistics taken from divorce courts and totally vitiated by false methods of analysis and are

¹ See Bernstein, "Voraussetzungen des Socialismus," pp. 46 *et seq.*

therefore unreliable. The great mass of the people of all classes read these things as interesting comments of the day, but naturally draw no serious conclusions from them.

The proposition so strongly urged by the early writers that the state regulate marriages is to-day being agitated. That criminality, insanity, mendicity, and physical defects might become less frequent did society more closely guard the institution of the family, is the hope of many, both scientists and laymen. While the movement has gone no farther yet than medical conferences and radical legislatures, it still exists, and a lack of confidence in the law of natural selection obtains in many minds. It is an illustration of the persistence of that happy optimism which marked the prerevolutionary times whose culmination is seen in the radical action of the French Revolution.

It only remains to restate those doctrines dominant before the Revolution which have been applied to some extent since. As has been said, prerevolutionary socialism had few definite theories on which to advance. From abstract reasoning on one hand and observation of primitive man on the other, there developed the theory of a state of nature and of natural rights. This notion played a large part both in social and political radicalism up to the French Revolution. Since that time the theory has been gradually abandoned, until

to-day few definitely declare for the doctrine. It is, however, unconsciously adhered to by radical theorists. All advocates of the destruction of property rights are aiming for a return to primitive man and natural society. Every proposition to disturb the monogamous family, either directly or by attacking those institutions on which it seems to depend, has as a logical result a return to a state of nature. For, as Spencer points out, the distinction between lower and higher forms of life grows through the process of superorganic evolution. The development of institutions means the departure from barbarism. In the same direction is the tendency to limit luxury and reduce wants to primary wants. This means a return to nature and to activities which respond to the natural appetites.

The doctrine of the right to subsistence which played so important a part before the Revolution has vastly changed as time has gone on. The radical claims of labor to certain rights, either to labor or to support, has given way to a demand for a more equitable scheme of distribution which would give to all a competency. To the modern problems of poverty, unemployment, and indigence all classes seem inclined to bring the aid of rational charity; and to the conflict of interests growing out of modern society, the reconciling spirit of a larger philanthropy.

To the early theory that environment is a most

fruitful cause of evil, modern times gives ever readier assent. Countless evidences seen in the treatment of criminals, of insane, and of paupers and of those activities to rid society of dangerous influences show a growing consciousness of social responsibility. Along with this develops the idea of man's worth and of his possibilities. Many of the educational ideas of the early writers have to-day been realized, and the opportunities for culture have been vastly extended.

Socialism has passed through three stages corresponding in a way to Comte's threefold classification of the progress of thought; the religious or romantic, the critical, and the scientific. The romantic period here discussed was marked by idealism both in the realm of social and of political thought. Though far less active in the former than in the latter, it has not been fruitless. Certainly the dreamers of the past have not lived in vain. Those who caught visions of the city beautiful and a regenerated society, and through them revealed the social possibilities of mankind, have had their mission. Nor is a material realization of these dreams necessary. There is a social idealism. There is a utopian attitude of mind. There is an optimism, which, transforming the world in the ideal, helps to transform it in the real. Into this lofty sphere of contemplation Plato moved and gave the world the "Republic." The Christian Fathers partook of this hope

and pictured and tried to realize the kingdom of God on earth. Mediæval asceticism hoped to solve the problem of a happy life by the doctrine and practice of a sublime self-abnegation. The humanists, beginning with Thomas More, combined the elements of both Greek and Christian culture and pictured a society ruled neither by the voluptuous luxury of the one nor by the austere stoicism of the other. From the gloom and disappointment of the French Revolution reformers again took refuge in the utopia of social bliss with Saint-Simon and Fourier, as philosophy had done in the idealism of Hegel and politics with Fichte.

Into the world of modern thought from a variety of sources have come the influences of the spirit of political optimism and social idealism. These are the corrective and cohesive forces in society. There arises in conflict with these, from the experience and observation of the hard facts of economic life, the spirit of individual unrest, of philosophical cynicism, and of social hopelessness, — destructive forces in social life. Men naturally partake of this spirit of optimism in vastly differing degrees. In most cases, however, it preserves them from seeing the world with a jaundiced eye, "to which all order festers, all things here are out of joint." It is not the least of the virtues of the prerevolutionary writers that they portrayed the possibilities of a regenerated society and thus furthered the spirit of optimism. As a

chief means to a realization of these hopes they emphasized the need of a higher spiritual development for all the members of society. Thus the capacities of all were to be ennobled and expanded.

This is the deeper intent of the thought of the humanist — Thomas More; it gives practical significance to the occult teachings of Campanella, forms the substance of the doctrines of Bacon, and is the foundation of the optimism of Morelly. The prerevolutionary doctrine, "To each according to his wants, from each according to his capacity," is a lofty concept of social relationships when, through proper economic adjustment, both wants and capacities are to be infinitely elevated and enlarged. Realizing as these writers did the power of desire and motive as social forces, they have shown the possibilities of a society where the one has been ennobled and rationalized, and the other has been broadened and humanized. Beyond this teaching few socialist writers have gone; up to it few have come. It is in harmony with such doctrine that the individual can realize his own highest worth, and that society can realize from him the truest service.

INDEX

- Academic nature of early socialism, 34; its transformation to a laboring man's movement, 34.
- Age of Discovery, its influence on social theory, 253; use made of primitive peoples by Swift, 36; influence on Thomas More, 36; origin of the romance of travel, 35.
- Agrarian Law, Babeuf's attack on it, 293.
- Agrarian Socialism early dominant, 44, 264.
- Anarchism defined, 16; its relation to socialism, 16-17; comparison with democracy, 16; practical tendencies of, 16.
- Aristotle, theory of social evolution of, 19; his relation to the "laissez-fairists," 20; influence on later thought, 144.
- Arnold of Brescia, an Italian socialist, 133.
- Asceticism, decline of, 88-90; influence of asceticism on classes, 88-89.
- Augustine, Saint, "The City of God," 65; his relation to More, 63.
- Babeuf, facts of his life, 289-290; his relation to the radicals, 290, 294; writings of, 292; communism of, 291, 293; his attack on society, 296; optimism of, 295; his theory of a class-conflict, 295-296.
- Bacon, notice of his life, 183; relation to Campanella, 184; "New Atlantis" of, 183, 185; social teachings of, 184; materialistic tendencies of, 186.
- Barnave, character of, 306; debt of socialism to, 307; environment theory of, 308; his doctrine of progress, 309; economic factor emphasized, 308; his theory of social origins, 309; property theory of, 309; a precursor of Frederick List, 311; his theory of the Revolution, 312-313; his relation to Marx, 307; his theory of inequality, 310.
- Beaurieu, a forerunner of Rousseau, 198.
- Bebel, a radical socialist, 323.
- Behn, Mrs., theory of, "Le bon sauvage," 36, 219; influence on Rousseau, 219.
- Bismarck and socialism, 323.
- Bodin, a political idealist, 138.
- Boissel, notice of his life, 283; property theory of, 284; his theory of distribution, 286; attack upon culture, 286; his opinion of Rousseau, 287; his relation to Morelly, 288.
- Campanella, authorities on his life, 134-135; his place in history of socialism, 136, 187; intellectual environment of, 137; comparison with More, 139-141; scientific method of, 142; his attitude toward Aristotle, 144-145, 179; general philosophy of, 145, 148-149; his theory of social harmony, 150, 190; his sympathy with Plato, 151, 170; Campanella and Bacon compared, 152; his debt to the Jesuits, 152, 159; cosmopolitan nature of, 161; his relations to the Papal See, 162, 188; political theory of, 165,

- 175; communism of, 168, 189; theory of the family, 170, 178; his means to social unity, 177, 179; economic theories of, 191-192; his relation to Harrington, 165, 189; his importance as a philosopher, 192.
- Capital, growth of industrial, 44, 47, 77-78; and labor exploitation, 78.
- Capitalistic period, beginnings of, 68, 77-78.
- Chappius, a contemporary of Linguet, 198.
- Christian Fathers, teachings of, 39; optimism of, 329.
- Chronology of socialistic schools, 39.
- Cicero, his theory of primitive man, 65.
- City-state, advocated by More, 128; fitness for a scheme of socialism, 30; spread of modern municipal socialism, 321; Campanella's theory of, 174.
- Clark's theory of distribution, 14.
- Class-conflict, opening of, 41, 70; effect of great plague on, 69-70; relation to socialism, 31-32, 316.
- Class-consciousness awakened in England, 69; evidences of, in France, 276, 296.
- Class-solidarity, causes leading to, 31, 72-73.
- Class-struggle, opening of, 41, 320; discussed by French radicals, 276; Boissel discusses the, 283; Babeuf gives causes of, 295.
- Colet quoted by More, 56.
- Collectivism defined, 13, 15; compared with socialism, 15; of Pecqueur and Vidal, 41; of Morelly, 264.
- Communism, definition of, 11, 259; advantages of, 111, 291; based upon philanthropy, 15; relation to socialism, 11; More's attitude to, 106; Bacon's theory of, 186; Campanella a moderate, 169; social changes it presupposes, 260; compared with orthodox economics, 12; of the French Revolution, 277-278, 291.
- Communitic experiments, 324-325.
- "Conspicuous waste" lacking under socialism, 28; luxury theory of More, 122.
- Crimes, causes of, discussed by More, 102; irresponsibility of the criminal, 103; relation of property to, 104; de Maistre's theory of, 104; of the French Revolution, 281.
- Democracy and Communism compared, 259.
- Democracy, its effect on radical socialism, 322.
- Division of labor and socialism, 318; More's theory of, 113, 115, 123; theory of Plato concerning, 113.
- D'Holbach, theories of, 200, 207.
- D'Holbach, theory of sensational knowledge, 234.
- Economic interpretation of history, 31-33, 189; its debt to eighteenth-century thought, 33, 205, 211; Ferraz quoted on this, 210.
- "Economic Man," teachings of socialism on, 120, 182, 221.
- Economy of consumption, 45; its relation to communism, 45.
- Educational schemes of Morelly, 271; his plan for technical schools, 272; he advocated public schools, 272; Jesuits and Campanella on, 156.
- Enclosures and the social unrest in England, 74; their effects upon labor, 79; "Boke of Surveying" on, 80, 97; effects on rent and prices, 81, 97; an extension of property-right, 54; and the industrial revolution, 78; More on their evils, 94-96; relation to communism, 83; rate of enclosures, 75; attempts at remedy, 81-82, 99.
- Engels, contribution to history of socialism, 4.
- English revolution compared with

- the French, 223-225; absence of socialistic tendencies, 225.
- Environment theory of evil, 26, 29, 143; a feature of socialism, 26; Barnave's theory of, 308; Morelly's theory, 256; Owen's use of it, 256; modern aspects of, 328-329.
- Erasmus concerning More, 56.
- Evolutionary notions absent in early socialism, 219, 222.
- Evolution and socialism, 315.
- Family, More's theory of, 112, 124; its connection with property, 113, 170; as a basis for social unity, 177; Plato's theory of, 177; size of family discussed, 123; control by the state, 123, 171; Campanella's theory of, 170; theory of Morelly on, 271; teachings of Boissel on, 287-288; theory of Saint-Just, 298; present attitude toward, 326; Saint-Just on, 298.
- Fitzherbert, writings of, 2.
- Foxwell quoted, 23.
- Franck, writings of, 3, 6.
- Friendship as a basis of social unity 178-179; theory of Aristotle discussed, 179; accepted by Campanella, 179.
- George, land theory of, 14, 326; Babeuf on land-holding, 294.
- "Goodness" theory of man stated, 219, 232; its importance for the social idealist, 232; relation to doctrine of innate ideas, 219; revolutionary nature of, 237; as held by French radicals, 233, 235; Morelly's use of, 252; the new basis of, 236.
- Grotius, theory of international law, 86; theory of property, 239.
- Grünberg on radicalism in France, 281.
- Harrington, compared with Campanella, 165.
- Helvétius, place among the French radicals, 198; his theory of goodness, 233-234; materialism of, 208; his theory of happiness, 234; state of nature theory, 214; theory of knowledge, 233; pleasure and pain theory of, 208-209.
- Historical economics of Knies and Roscher, 257.
- History and Socialism, 225-227; Ihering quoted on, 226.
- History disregarded by radicals, 215, 256; unhistorical method of revolution, 53, 218; practical reasons for this, 217; "conjectural history" of eighteenth century, 216; Jowett quoted on this, 222.
- Hobbes, theory of state of nature of, 237; property theory of, 241.
- Humanism of More, 91; its influence on social ideals, 88, 320.
- Hume quoted on social harmony, 231.
- Huss and the Bohemian revolt, 89; "Articles of the Peasants," 99, 100; failure of revolt, 134.
- Idealism, its value in society, 329.
- Ihering quoted on history and socialism, 226.
- Individualism, growth of, since Reformation, 23; in sphere of economic life, 108, 319; its relation to property, 83; pleasure and pain, philosophy of, 211.
- Insurrectionary Committee, theories of property, 294; its relation to Babeuf, 292.
- International socialism, its origin, 48; causes of its failure, 317, 320; conditions leading to, 45-46; doctrines of Adam Smith, 47; suggested by early writers, 164.
- Italy, social theories in, 132.
- Janet, works cited, 3.
- Jaurès on radical socialism, 277.
- Jesuits, their relation to Campanella, 153; communistic state in Paraguay, 153, 155; outline

- of their plan, 155; family theory of, 157; comparison of theories with those of Campanella, 158.
- Kant's faith in democracy, 217.
- Kautsky on Thomas More, 6.
- Labor day, length of by More, 115-116; socialistic theory of, 167; advantages of short day, 117; Campanella on, 168; treated by Morelly, 265.
- Labor-theory of Campanella, 167, 173, 181; of Morelly, 262; division of labor and socialism, 318.
- "Laissez-fairists'" theory, 19, 20.
- Landlordism, condemned by More, 100; its relations to single-tax, 326.
- Lassalle, theories of, 14.
- Latimer's Sermons, 2.
- Leisure class, attacked by More, 118; enlarged upon by Campanella, 172; theory of Saint-Just on, 299-300.
- Leroux, writings of, 2.
- Lichtenberger, writings of, 4; his theory of French Revolution, 282.
- Linguet, a radical socialist, 197; theory of property of, 304-305; importance of, 304.
- Locke, state of nature theory, 213; property theory of, 52, 238.
- Mably, place of, in economic history, 300, 302; writings of, 301; property theory of, 302; analytic method of, 303; importance to socialism, 303.
- Machiavellian school, More opposed to, 86; theory of social life, 91; its theory of absolutism, 129.
- Malon, works of, 3.
- "Manifesto" of Karl Marx, 47; its radical nature, 24, 41.
- "Man of Nature" theory stated by Pufendorf, 25.
- Marriage, theory of Campanella, 178; theory of Plato, 171-172; Bacon's theory of, 185; modern notions on, 327; Boissel's teachings on, 288; Saint-Just discusses theory of, 298.
- Marx, unites old and new socialism, 7, 22, 319; originator scientific socialism, 41, 42; his "International," 47.
- Materialism and eighteenth-century socialism, 205, 207, 210.
- "Materialistic interpretation" of history, 205; its origin, 204; use of theory of class-struggle, 32; absence of class-conflict in the earlier period, 33; teachings of Barnave on, 311.
- Menger cited, 5.
- Mercier, a defender of the old order, 203; his conflict with Mably, 300.
- Meslier, life notice, 243; his condemnation of property, 243; a forerunner of Voltaire, 243; his relation to socialism, 244.
- Metaphysics of eighteenth century basis for social theories, 204; Campanella, emphasis of, 147.
- Militarism, attitude of socialism to, 105.
- Mill, socialist tendencies of, 13.
- Mohl, von, writings of, 2.
- Monopolies, condemned by More, 98.
- Montesquieu's theory of labor, 48.
- More, Thomas, life of, 54, 55; place in England, 55; associates of, 56; literary ability of, 59; sources of his thought, 61, 63; a social student, 77; reactionary nature of, 82; his attitude toward the Reformation, 84; he favors the New Learning, 84; apparent inconsistency of, 86; his attitude toward asceticism, 91; humanism of, 102, 121; conservatism of, 110, 115; his relation to Malthus, 125; he anticipates Ricardo, 126; his importance for socialism, 129.
- Morelly, facts concerning his life, 195; writings of, 199; his importance to later socialism, 196, 250; method of, 197, 248; his

- two views of society, 249; theory of origin of evil, 255-256, 258; he denies theory of innate ideas, 251; theory of "fall of man," 254; his crucial question, 250; his attitude toward history, 256; social motives discussed, 261; his new "social unit," 262; he condemns property, 257; general estimate of, 273-274; political ideas of, 268; importance of his social theory, 258; his theory of social organization, 268-269.
- Motives, in proposed system, 28, 110; discussed by Campanella, 180; arise from fitness of employment to capacity and inclination, 180; theory of Morelly concerning, 261; social instincts as a source of, 263; Fourier's theory of, 181, 263.
- Municipal socialism and early ideals, 320.
- National workshops in France, 52; lessons taught by, 44.
- "Natural rights" doctrine, 211, 249; statements of, in age of Morelly, 212, 215; right to labor based upon, 52; involves right to subsistence, 284; nature of the theory in France, 213; present standing of, 327.
- Non-productive labor, absent under socialism, 117; More's theory of, 119.
- Optimism of eighteenth century, 29, 227, 300; principles on which it rested, 29, 228; nature of this optimism, 229; advocates of, 229; reconciliation of public and private interests, 230, 231; need of optimism in society, 330.
- Owen, Robert, environment theory of, 256.
- Peixotto cited on economic aspect of society, 315; contribution to history of socialism, 5.
- Physiocrats, theory of, 19.
- Plague, the, its effects on social classes, 70.
- Plato, theory of social control, 17, 19; relation to Aristotle, 19; influence over More, 64; intellectual father of socialists, 64; outgrowth of his theory, 20; optimism of, 329.
- Pleasure and pain theory, of More, 121; of French radicals, 211; its logical conclusions, 211, 273-274. "Polizei-staat," German idea of, 91; More's idea of, 91.
- Population, theory of More, 124-125; comparison of More and Malthus, 125; overpopulation not a socialist doctrine, 126; Barnave on dynamics of increasing population, 309.
- Possibilities of socialism, 255.
- Profits, condemned by More, 100.
- Property, its relation to individualism, 108; a historical fact, 27, 29, 107, 284; justification of, in "natural rights" and social utility theories, 109; theories before the Revolution, 242; Locke quoted on, 238; Pufendorf quoted on, 240; Hobbes theory of property, 241; Meslier denies property-right, 243; theory of Rousseau, 244-245; Mably on property-right, 302; effect of French Revolution on, 278; stability of, 325-326; modern attitude to, 325; Grotius, theory of, 239; Babeuf discusses its evils, 293.
- Property theory of labor, Locke's statement of, 52.
- Proudhon, definition of political economy, 9; of socialism, 10, 323.
- Pufendorf, the state of nature, 25.
- Race-problem and socialism, 320-321.
- Radicalism in France, 202, 276; in how far was it socialistic, 277, 279, 297; its tendency toward the theories of Morelly, 279.

- Radical socialism, climax of, 43; decline of, in France, 13; in Germany, 12.
- Reactionary nature of socialism, 82, 188.
- Reformation, socialism after, 23-24; attitude of More toward, 84-85.
- Revolutionary thought, its three prerequisites, 68.
- Reybaud, writings of, 2, 4.
- "Right to labor" theory, when advanced, 49; its relation to right to subsistence, 49.
- "Right to subsistence," its early appearance, 49; communism its logical conclusion, 49; Locke's theory of, 50; relation to compulsory labor, 51; modern changes in, 328.
- Rodbertus, a scientific socialist, 94.
- Romance of Travel, a source of social ideals, 35, 61.
- Romantic age of socialism, 38; causes of the romance, 35; influence of travel, 35, 61.
- Rousseau, social theories of, 245; not a communist, 244; says property is a necessary evil, 247; writings of, 200; compared with Locke, 245.
- Saint-Just, theory of the family, 298; advocates public care of children, 298; theory of property of, 299; on right of inheritance, 299; condemns evils of idle class, 299.
- Savigny, theory of social control, 226.
- Sceptical philosophy and social theory, 203.
- School of socialism, lines of unity in, 21, 39.
- Schultze-Delitzsch, a reformer, 41; his controversy with Lassalle, 14.
- Scientific Socialism, origin of, 42, 147; Karl Marx father of, 43; comparison with utopian school, 10, 42.
- Seebohm, writings of, 5; quoted on More, 56.
- Slavery, Campanella theory of, 167.
- Slavery, Campanella on, 158, 167, 173.
- Smith, A., beginnings of cosmopolitan economics, 47.
- Social compact, right to labor a result of, 52; held by Morelly, 270.
- Social Democracy, outlook for, 322.
- Socialism, definition of, 7, 9, 267; a lower-class movement, 8, 21; relation to communism, 11, 15; compared with orthodox economics, 12; and justice, 15; its philosophy of life, 20, 30, 146; reactionary tendencies in, 82, 188; debt to early writers, 44; its relation to materialism, 42-43, 147; possibilities of, 255; new problems of, 316; despotic tendencies of early, 26-27, 129.
- "Socialism of the chair" a reaction, 323.
- Socialization and socialism, 45-46; early tendencies toward, 47; influences of industrial capital on, 47.
- "Société des Égaux," teachings of, 290; its organ, *Tribune du Peuple*, 290; relation to Babeuf, 291.
- Starkey, Dialogues of, 2.
- "Statute of Laborers," purposes of, 71; foreshadows rise of classes, 76.
- Stein, contribution of, 2.
- "Surplus-Value" theory, a basic principle of scientific socialism, 13, 14, 21.
- Tacitus, student of primitive man, 62.
- Telesius, the inspirer of Campanella, 138.
- Trades-unions and socialism, 324.
- Tribune du Peuple*, theories taught in, 290.
- "Utopia," first appearances of, 57; translation of, 57; sources of

- thought, 61, 65-67; compared with Plato's "Republic," 64; opinions of contemporaries concerning, 58-59; its value as history, 59; the best and earliest romance of travel, 63.
- Utopian socialism, its unhistorical view point, 218; compared with scientific, 10, 221-222, 319; its constructive method, 171, 201; periods dominated by, 40.
- Veblen on the optimism of Smith, 230.
- Virchow and the theory of evolution, 226, 315.
- Volney, a neglected writer, 231; teachings on social concord, 231; optimism of, 231.
- Wage-problem in time of More, 81.
- Wants, primary ones as lasting motive to industry, 120; chances of their satisfaction under socialism, 120; theory to solve social problem by reducing number of, 119.
- Wealth, More's teachings concerning, 119, 127; problem of poverty a relative one, 120; Morely's classification of, 266.
- Woman, place of, in More's scheme, 115.

"Socialism grew to be a very important question during the nineteenth century; in all probability it will be the supreme question of the twentieth." — T. K.

A History of Socialism

By THOMAS KIRKUP

Third Edition, revised and enlarged

Cloth, 8vo, 400 pages and index, \$2.25 net

"The aim of the present book is twofold: to set forth the leading phases of historic socialism; and to attempt a criticism and interpretation of the movement as a whole." — T. K.

COMMENTS OF THE PRESS

"Unquestionably the best study of Socialism in the English language . . . of the utmost value." — *Manchester Guardian*.

"A book which should be on the shelves of every public library and every workingman's club." — *Pall Mall Gazette*, London.

"The chapter on the growth of Socialism has been completely rewritten in order to bring it up to date. . . . He is singularly free from the exaggerated statement and declamatory style which characterize the writing of so many socialists, and the concluding pages of the present volume show him at his best. . . . None have surpassed Mr. Kirkup in philosophical grasp of the essentials of Socialism or have presented the doctrine in more intelligible form." — *The Nation*.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Sixty-four and Sixty-six Fifth Ave., New York

OTHER WORKS ON SOCIALISM

By JOHN SPARGO

Socialism

A Summary and Interpretation of Socialist Principles

12mo, Cloth, \$1.25 net

"The 'man in the street' will find this little volume an up-to-date exposition of the Socialism that is alive in the world to-day."
— *Review of Reviews*.

"Anything of Mr. Spargo's is well worth reading, for it is written with conviction and with a sense of concrete life far removed from mere doctrinairism. . . . Anybody who wants to know exactly what the American Marxian of the saner sort is aiming at will find it here. In view of the present situation it is a book that every thoughtful person will want to read and read carefully."
— *World To-Day*.

By JACK LONDON

War of the Classes

By the Author of "The People of the Abyss," etc.

Cloth, \$1.50 net, paper, 25 cts. net

"A series of correlated essays, direct and trenchant in style, fresh and vigorous in thought, and . . . exceedingly entertaining in manner." — *New York Sun*.

By GUSTAV LEBON

The Psychology of Socialism

By the Author of "The Crowd," etc.

Cloth, 8vo, \$3.00 net

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Sixty-four and Sixty-six Fifth Ave., New York



007806018008

LH 7/11/61

Guthrie, William Buck
Socialism before the French Revolution.

HX

21

G8

cop.2

University of Toronto
Library

B
DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

